Calendar No. 117

102D CONGRESS *1st Session*	SENATE	REPORT 102-80

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1992

JUNE 12 (legislative day JUNE 11), 1991.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Appropriations,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 2427]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 2427) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with various amendments and presents herewith information relative to the changes recommended:

AMOUNT IN NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY, FISCAL YEAR 1992

Amount of bill as passed by the House	$21,494,999,000
Budget estimates considered by House	21,609,828,000
Budget estimates considered by Senate	21,609,828,000
Amount of bill as reported to the Senate	21,984,482,000
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Over the budget estimate, 1992	+374,654,000
Over the House-passed bill	+489,483,000

S183-3

CONTENTS

TITLE I

Department of Defense—Civil: Department of the Army:
  Corps of Engineers—Civil: Pa
    Construction, general
    Flood control and coastal emergencies
    Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries
    General expenses
    General investigations
    General regulatory functions
    Operation and maintenance, general

TITLE II

Department of the Interior:
  Bureau of Reclamation:
    Construction Program
    Emergency fund
    General administrative expenses
    General investigations
    Loan Program
    Operation and maintenance
    Working Capital Fund

TITLE III

Department of Energy:
  Atomic energy defense activities 1
  Departmental administration 1
  Energy supply, research and development activities
  Federal Energy Regulatory Commission 1
  General science and research activities 1
  Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund 1
  Office of Inspector General 1
  Power marketing administrations:
    Alaska Power Administration 1
    Bonneville Power Administration 1
    Southeastern Power Administration 1
    Southwestern Power Administration 1
    Western Area Power Administration 1
  Uranium supply and enrichment activities 1

TITLE IV

Independent Agencies:
  Appalachian Regional Commission 1
  Defense Nuclear Safety Board 1
  Delaware River Basin Commission 1
  Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin 1
  Nuclear Regulatory Commission 1
  Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board 1
  Office of Inspector General 1
  Susquehanna River Basin Commission 1
  Tennessee Valley Authority 1

Purpose

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 1992 beginning October 1, 1991, and ending September 30, 1992, for energy and water development, and for other related purposes. It supplies funds for water resources development programs and related activities of the Department of the Army, Civil Functions—U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works Program in title I; for the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation in title II; for the Department of Energy's energy research activities (except for fossil fuel programs and certain conservation and regulatory functions), including environmental restoration and waste management, and atomic energy defense activities in title III; and for related independent agencies and commissions, including the Appalachian Regional Commission and Appalachian regional development programs, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority in title IV.

Summary of Estimates and Recommendations

The fiscal year 1992 budget estimates for the bill total $21,609,828,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals $21,984,482,000. This is $372,654,000 over the budget estimates and $489,483,000 over the House bill.

Bill Highlights

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The amount recommended in the bill includes $11,968,000,000 for atomic energy defense activities. Major programs and activities include:

Testing	$519,077,000
Research and development	1,457,573,000
Production and surveillance	2,590,478,000
Nuclear materials production	1,891,900,000
Defense waste management and environmental restoration	3,640,372,000
New production reactor	483,000,000

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

The bill recommended by the Committee provides a total of $2,940,916,000 for energy supply, research, development and demonstration programs including:

Solar energy	$158,866,000
Environmental restoration and waste management (nondefense)	602,495,000
Nuclear fission R&D	346,658,000
Magnetic fusion	337,100,000
Basic energy sciences	737,700,000
Biological and environmental health	326,460,000

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation also provides a net appropriation of $1,507,489,000 for general science and research activities in life sciences, high energy physics, and nuclear physics. Major programs are:

High energy physics research	$637,999,000
Nuclear physics	354,390,000
Superconducting super collider	508,700,000

REGULATORY AND OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Also recommended in the bill is $502,706,000 for various regulatory and independent agencies of the Federal Government. Major programs include:

Appalachian Regional Commission	$190,000,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	141,071,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	512,500,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	135,000,000

Budgetary Constraints

DOMESTIC DISCRETIONARY PROGRAMS

Preparing a bill under the budget summit agreement for fiscal year 1992 has been an extremely difficult task for the Committee given the many important activities—basic science and research, renewable energy research and development, providing for the water resources infrastructure needs, and the science education and technology requirements funded in the bill. The Committee was faced with minimum funding requirements in excess of $500, 000,000 just to maintain the current level of effort in fiscal year 1992. When you consider the total requirements to support the country's leadership in technology and those programs which support the economic strength of the country, the Committee was faced with a total requirement of $700,000,000 over the President's request.

So, while the Committee did receive additional allocation above the President's request for domestic programs, it was only sufficient to provide a small increase over the current year level when adjusted for the reductions required to meet the budget summit agreement for 1991.

The Committee deliberations and decisions on funding levels for current programs were based on the Committee's desire to first provide for ongoing programs and projects which were either unfunded or underfunded in the President's budget for 1992. Then second, if resources remained, to address high-priority new activities brought to the Committee's attention.

The Committee is very concerned with the outlook for budgetary resources and the severe financial pressures on domestic programs in fiscal year 1993 and beyond. It should be pointed out that the budget summit agreement for fiscal year 1993 does not even provide an inflationary increase for domestic programs, so future commitments had to be held to a minimum.

Mindful of the restricted budgetary situation, the Committee has had to limit it's recommendation for new construction starts for the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. The Committee has not been able to recommend many projects which are worthy and ready to be started, for which outyear funding will not be available.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

The Committee has also recommended appropriations totaling approximately $4,549,187,000 for Federal water resource development programs. This includes projects and related activities of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Federal water resource development program provides lasting benefits to the Nation in the area of flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, irrigation of agricultural lands, water conservation, commercial navigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement.

Water is our Nation's most precious and valuable resource. It is evident that water supply in the near future will be as important, if not more so, than energy. There is only so much water available. Water cannot be manufactured. Our Nation cannot survive without water, and economic prosperity cannot occur without a plentiful supply.

While many areas of the country suffer from severe shortages of water, others suffer from the other extreme—an excess of water which threatens both rural and urban areas with floods. Because water is a national asset, and because the availability and control of water affect and benefit all States and jurisdictions, the Federal Government has historically assumed much of the responsibility for financing of water resource development.

The existing national water resource infrastructure in America is an impressive system of dams, locks, harbors, canals, irrigation systems, reservoirs, and recreation sites with a central purpose—to serve the public's needs.

Our waterways and harbors are an essential part of our national transportation system—providing clean, efficient, and economical transportation of fuels for energy generation and agricultural production, and making possible residential and industrial development to provide homes and jobs for the American people.

Reservoir projects provide hydroelectric power production and downstream flood protection, make available recreational opportunities for thousands of urban residents, enhance fish and wildlife habitat, and provide our communities and industries with abundant and clean water supplies which are essential not only to life itself, but also to help maintain a high standard of living for the American people.

When projects are completed, they make enormous contributions to America. The benefits derived from completed projects, in many instances, vastly exceed those contemplated during project development.

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN SALMON ENDANGERED SPECIES PETITIONS

For the past year the Committee has followed closely the developments associated with the filing of endangered species petitions on five runs of wild Columbia and Snake River salmon. This interest was heightened further with the National Marine Fisheries Service's April 5, 1991, publication in the Federal Register of its proposal to list the Snake River sockeye salmon as an endangered species, and its June 7, 1991, announcement to propose to list the

Snake River fall and spring/summer chinook salmon runs as threatened species.

It is not the intent of the Committee to prejudge the outcome of the scientific review process which, admittedly, will attempt to answer questions never before raised in the public policy area. Nevertheless, the Committee believes that the listing of even one salmon run as endangered under the Endangered Species Act could have tremendous economic and environmental ramifications for the Pacific Northwest. Accordingly, the Committee is supportive of the Pacific Northwest's salmon summit and other regional efforts to reach agreement on a package of short-term and long-term measures which can be implemented to help the salmon while minimizing the impacts on the region's economy.

On May 2, 1991, the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development held a field hearing in Portland, OR, to receive testimony on the progress associated with the salmon summit. At that hearing, the Governors of the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington presented the subcommittee with the official report of the salmon summit. The report was endorsed by the Federal agencies, electric utilities, Indian tribes, and other interest groups. In addition, the Governors of Idaho, Oregon, and Washington also presented the subcommittee with their regional salmon program for 1991. These two agreement packages included such provisions as increased flows in the Snake River to assist migrating juvenile salmon; and proposed modifications in river operations, predation control, transportation, harvest, habitat and production facilities, and other measures to better fit the needs of naturally spawning fish.

The Governors of the four States have agreed that the Northwest Power Planning Council now will begin the process of amending the Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program by incorporating the earlier agreements and to address the long-term aspects of salmon recovery for those stocks most at risk. Many of these actions will be funded through the Bonneville Power Administration. Based on Bonneville's current financial situation and budget flexibility, the Committee directs BPA to act in a manner consistent with the Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program, as amended, to incorporate activities to enhance the petitioned stocks. The Committee expects BPA to implement these activities as expeditiously as possible. Bonneville and the Power Planning Council shall report periodically to the Committees on Appropriations on progress in implementing these salmon measures.

It is the Committee's desire that the Pacific Northwest region attempt to reach agreement on recovery actions at the earliest possible date, and urges the Bonneville Power Administration, Corps of Engineers, and Bureau of Reclamation to continue working with the other parties to develop a comprehensive set of actions to implement the proposals. Only through the cooperative approach of all parties can this problem be resolved. The comprehensive approach should deal with the management of harvest, habitat, inriver flows and other survival measures, and hatchery management. The Committee expects that the Corps, the Bureau, and Bonneville all will strive to interpret their existing authorities to enable the implementation of the salmon summit's agreements and any amendments to the Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program.

The Committee also notes that the Senate Energy Committee has endorsed legislation which would direct the Secretary of the Interior to explore and develop water conservation projects. Because such projects could potentially benefit the Columbia River Basin salmon, the Committee encourages Bonneville, the Corps, and the Bureau to pursue such activities.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations held seven sessions in connection with the fiscal year 1992 appropriation bill. Witnesses included officials and representatives of the Federal agencies, numerous Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, Governors, State and local officials and representatives, and hundreds of private citizens of all walks of life from throughout the United States. Testimony, both for and against many items, was presented to the subcommittee. The recommendations for fiscal year 1992, therefore, have been developed after careful consideration of available data.

VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

The subcommittee, by unanimous vote on June 11, 1991, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the full Committee on Appropriations.

The Committee, by unanimous vote of a quorum present on June 12, 1991, recommended that the bill, as amended be reported to the Senate.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1991	$146,435,000
Budget estimate, 1992	160,342,000
House allowance	200,566,000
Committee recommendation	176,211,000

An appropriation of $176,211,000 is recommended by the Committee.

The recommended amounts provided under this account for surveys and planning activities are shown in the following table, with Committee comments following immediately after the tabulation.

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	ALABAMA								
(N)	CHICKASAW CREEK, AL	339,000	78,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	CHOCTAWHATCHEE AND PEA RIVER BASINS, AL & FL	2,400,000	301,000	475,000	---	475,000	---	475,000	---
(FDP)	VALLEY CREEK, WARRIOR RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, AL	892,000	723,000	169,000	---	169,000	---	169,000	---
	ALASKA								
(N)	COOK INLET	495,000	---	---	---	---	---	495,000	---
(FDP)	SEWARD, FOURTH OF JULY CREEK, AK	255,000	100,000	51,000	---	51,000	---	51,000	---
(FDP)	SEWARD, LOWELL CREEK, AK	581,000	225,000	306,000	---	306,000	---	306,000	---
(N)	WRANGELL NARROWS/DRY STRAIT	350,000	---	---	---	---	---	350,000	---
	ARIZONA								
(FDP)	CENTRAL MARICOPA COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	1,320,000	226,000	320,000	---	320,000	---	320,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, LOWER SANTA CRUZ RIVER, AZ	1,264,000	1,181,000	83,000	---	83,000	---	83,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER INDIAN COMMUNITY, AZ	520,000	200,000	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
(FDP)	HASSAYAMPA RIVER AT WICKENBURG, AZ	790,000	226,000	74,000	---	74,000	---	74,000	---
(FC)	HOLBROOK, AZ	9,650,000	2,079,000	---	140,000	---	140,000	---	140,000
(FC)	LOWER SANTA CRUZ RIVER, AZ	45,000,000	---	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FC)	NOGALES WASH, AZ	---	---	---	---	---	330,000	---	330,000
(FC)	RILLITO RIVER, AZ	16,300,000	1,715,000	---	1,075,000	---	1,075,000	---	1,075,000
(FDP)	TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	1,340,000	525,000	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
	ARKANSAS								
(FDP)	ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN LEVEES, AR & OK	---	---	---	---	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FDP)	ARKANSAS RIVER WETLANDS AND FLOOD CONTROL, AR	1,000,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	CENTRAL ARKANSAS STUDY, AR	1,570,000	600,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	LITTLE RIVER COUNTY, AR	500,000	150,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	OUACHITA RIVER BASIN, HOT SPRINGS, GARLAND COUNTY, AR.	1,885,000	660,000	608,000	---	608,000	---	608,000	---
(N)	WHITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, AR & MO	925,000	625,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	CALIFORNIA								
(FC)	AMERICAN AND SACRAMENTO RIVERS, CA	658,000,000	536,000	---	5,000,000	---	5,000,000	---	5,000,000
(FDP)	CALLEGUAS CREEK, CA	1,055,000	301,000	220,000	---	220,000	---	220,000	---
(FC)	CARNEROS CREEK, CA	4,800,000	---	---	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000
(SPE)	COAST OF CA, STORM & TIDALWAVES, S. COAST REGION, CA	2,250,000	400,000	460,000	---	460,000	---	460,000	---
(FC)	COYOTE & BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA	48,400,000	2,509,000	---	625,000	---	1,475,000	---	625,000
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	1,195,000	764,000	315,000	---	315,000	---	315,000	---
	IMPERIAL BEACH AND CORONADO SHORELINES, CA	---	---	---	---	350,000	---	---	---
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA	141,000,000	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	1,200,000	800,000	---	2,000,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	163,500,000	584,000	---	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---	3,000,000
	LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHORE PROTECTION, CA	---	---	---	---	350,000	---	---	---
	LOS ANGELES RIVER WATERCOURSE IMPROVEMENT, CA	---	---	---	---	1,000,000	---	---	---
(FC)	LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA	9,100,000	676,000	---	900,000	---	900,000	---	900,000
(FDP)	MARIN COUNTY SHORELINE, SAN CLEMENTE CREEK, CA	1,100,000	113,000	327,000	---	327,000	---	327,000	---
	MISSION BAY, SAN DIEGO COUNTY, SHORE PROTECTION, CA	---	---	---	---	350,000	---	---	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
(N)	MONTEREY HARBOR, CA..................................	860,000	351,000	132,000	---	132,000	---	132,000	---
(N)	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA..................................	1,235,000	133,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FC)	NAPA RIVER, CA..................................	90,100,000	5,263,000	---	1,550,000	---	1,550,000	---	1,550,000
	NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA..................................	---	---	---	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
	NORCO BLUFFS, SANTA ANA RIVER, CA....................	---	---	---	---	425,000	---	425,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, CACHE CREEK BASIN, CA....	1,200,000	376,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, YOLO BYPASS, CA..........	1,250,000	500,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA.....	1,250,000	782,000	325,000	---	325,000	---	325,000	---
(N)	NOYO RIVER & HARBOR, CA..................................	24,300,000	1,473,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000
(FDP)	RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA..................................	985,000	595,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(SPE)	SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA....................	5,940,000	3,178,000	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---
	SAN DIEGO WATER SUPPLY, CA..................................	---	---	---	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(SP)	SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY, OCEAN BEACH, CA....................	875,000	396,000	160,000	---	160,000	---	160,000	---
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA..................................	875,000	226,000	324,000	---	324,000	---	324,000	---
	SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY WATER SUPPLY, CA..................	---	---	---	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN R. BASIN, CALIENTE CK STREAM GROUP, CA....	3,389,000	2,277,000	212,000	---	212,000	---	212,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, ARROYO PASAJERO & CANTUA CREE	2,087,000	188,000	700,000	---	700,000	---	700,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, KAWEAH RIVER, CA............	1,201,000	1,153,000	48,000	---	48,000	---	48,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, MOKELUMNE RIVER & TRIBS, CA..	1,225,000	490,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, SAN JOAQUIN R MAIN STEM & TRI	1,875,000	188,000	612,000	---	612,000	---	612,000	---
(FC)	SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA..................................	3,510,000	10,000	---	100,000	---	200,000	---	100,000
(N)	SAN RAFAEL CANAL, CA..................................	15,500,000	113,000	---	1,500,000	---	1,500,000	---	1,500,000
(FDP)	SANTA ANA RIVER & ORANGE CO, CA....................	9,560,000	9,434,000	126,000	---	126,000	---	126,000	---
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA..................................	3,500,000	30,000	---	325,000	---	325,000	---	325,000
(N)	SANTA CRUZ HARBOR SHOALING, CA....................	900,000	150,000	310,000	---	310,000	---	310,000	---
(N)	SANTA MONICA BREAKWATER, CA....................	760,000	432,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FC)	TULE RIVER, CA..................................	17,800,000	---	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FDP)	UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA..................................	1,500,000	706,000	430,000	---	430,000	---	430,000	---
(FDP)	WALNUT CREEK BASIN, CA..................................	1,801,000	1,544,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN, CA..................................	895,000	256,000	170,000	---	170,000	---	170,000	---
	COLORADO								
(FC)	ALAMOSA, CO..................................	6,000,000	234,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FDP)	BOXELDER, SPRING, & DRY CREEKS, FT. COLLINS, CO.......	460,000	170,000	140,000	---	140,000	---	140,000	---
(FDP)	GOOSE CREEK, BOULDER, CO..................................	323,000	130,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	RALSTON AND LEYDEN CREEKS, CO..................................	430,000	265,000	165,000	---	165,000	---	165,000	---
	DELAWARE								
(N)	C&D CANAL-BALTIMORE HBR CONNECTING CHLS (DEEPENIG), DE	2,615,000	1,018,000	800,000	---	800,000	---	800,000	---
(SP)	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE & NJ....................	2,550,000	450,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(SP)	DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, D	2,250,000	750,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
	FLORIDA								
(SP)	BREVARD COUNTY, FL..................................	338,000	110,000	110,000	---	110,000	---	110,000	---
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL..................................	7,570,000	301,000	---	399,000	---	399,000	---	399,000
(FDP)	COAST OF FLORIDA EROSION AND STORM EFFECTS STUDY, FL..	8,230,000	1,733,000	75,000	---	750,000	---	75,000	---
(FDP)	FROG POND, FL..................................	625,000	175,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING	SENATE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	SENATE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
(FDP)	HILLSBORO CANAL, FL	774,000	525,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
	HILLSBORO INLET, FL	---	---	---	---	---	150,000	---	---
(BE)	MARTIN COUNTY, FL	40,800,000	---	---	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000
	MIAMI RIVER SEDIMENTS, FL	---	---	---	---	---	200,000	---	---
(BE)	NASSAU COUNTY, FL	10,200,000	---	---	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000
(N)	PALM VALLEY BRIDGE, FL	720,000	300,000	360,000	---	360,000	---	360,000	---
(BE)	PANAMA CITY BEACHES, FL	40,208,000	2,034,000	---	850,000	---	850,000	---	850,000
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	6,715,000	257,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000
(FDP)	PERDIDO KEY BEACHES, FL	3,800,000	23,000	277,000	---	277,000	---	277,000	---
	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	---	---	---	---	150,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	TAMPA BAY, FL (COASTAL AREAS)	1,000,000	190,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR, ALAFIA RIVER AND BIG BEND, FL	250,000	200,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
	GEORGIA								
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	62,240,000	25,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000
(SP)	GLYNN COUNTY BEACHES, GA	891,000	550,000	341,000	---	341,000	---	341,000	---
(N)	LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA & SC	400,000	113,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(MP)	RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM & LAKE, WILDLIFE MITIGATION, GA	20,150,000	271,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR COMPREHENSIVE, GA	17,457,000	38,000	---	250,000	---	800,000	---	550,000
(FDP)	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA, SC & NC	968,000	518,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	HAWAII								
(FDP)	URBAN FLOOD CONTROL - HONOLULU, HI	840,000	321,000	219,000	---	219,000	---	219,000	---
	IDAHO								
(FC)	LITTLE WOOD RIVER, VICINITY OF GOODING AND SHOSHONE, I	4,050,000	326,000	---	174,000	---	174,000	---	174,000
	ILLINOIS								
(FDP)	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL	1,066,000	482,000	310,000	---	310,000	---	310,000	---
(FDP)	APPLE CREEK, IL	1,200,000	301,000	229,000	---	229,000	---	229,000	---
	CHICAGO RIVER, NORTH BRANCH, IL	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	CASINO BEACH, IL	---	---	---	---	---	375,000	---	---
	CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	---	---	---	---	---	325,000	---	150,000
(FDP)	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	1,685,000	1,151,000	224,000	---	224,000	---	224,000	---
	ILLINOIS WATERWAY NAVIGATION STUDY, IL	---	---	---	---	2,185,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FDP)	KASKASKIA RIVER BASIN, IL	705,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
	MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS (CUP), IL	---	---	---	---	---	3,000,000	---	---
(RCP)	UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, IL, IA, MN,.	7,000,000	1,100,000	1,200,000	---	1,200,000	---	1,200,000	---
	INDIANA								
	FALLS OF THE OHIO WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AREA, IN & KY.	---	---	---	---	---	250,000	---	---
(FC)	FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA, IN	27,000,000	1,900,000	---	525,000	---	525,000	---	525,000
	INDIANAPOLIS, IN	---	---	---	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FDP)	INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER BASIN, IN	2,500,000	38,000	462,000	---	462,000	---	462,000	---
	LAKE GEORGE, HOBART, IN	---	---	---	---	---	330,000	---	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN (CADY MARSH DITCH), IN.....	---	---	---	---	---	370,000	---	170,000
	ORLEANS AND ORANGE COUNTY, IN..........................	---	---	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	WABASH RIVER BASIN COMP. STUDY, IN & IL (MID REACHES).	840,000	640,000	100,000	---	300,000	---	100,000	---
	WHITE RIVER, INDIANAPOLIS CENTRAL WATERFRONT, IN......	---	---	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
	IOWA								
(FDP)	BLACK HAWK COUNTY, IA..................................	410,000	160,000	90,000	---	90,000	---	90,000	---
(FC)	PERRY CREEK, IA..	38,600,000	1,832,000	---	35,000	---	35,000	---	268,000
(FDP)	THURMAN TO HAMBURG, IA - PUMPING FACILITIES...........	234,000	127,000	107,000	---	107,000	---	107,000	---
	WEST DES MOINES - DES MOINES, IA......................	---	---	---	---	---	700,000	---	350,000
	KANSAS								
(FC)	BIG BLUE RIVER, MARYSVILLE, KS........................	200,000	---	---	---	---	---	200,000	---
(FC)	ARKANSAS CITY, KS......................................	13,800,000	1,109,000	---	411,000	---	411,000	---	411,000
(RCP)	SOLDIER CREEK DIVERSION UNIT, TOPEKA, KS..............	480,000	255,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO...........................	864,000	628,000	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
(FC)	UPPER LITTLE ARKANSAS RIVER WATERSHED, KS.............	11,300,000	1,337,000	---	463,000	---	463,000	---	463,000
(FC)	WINFIELD, KS...	6,750,000	301,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000
	KENTUCKY								
	HICKMAN BLUFF, KY......................................	250,000	---	---	---	---	---	250,000	---
(FC)	BEAVER CREEK BASIN, KY.................................	---	150,000	---	50,000	---	300,000	---	50,000
(N)	CUMBERLAND-TENNESSEE RIVERS, KY, GA, AL, MS, NC, TN &.	9,951,000	9,450,000	501,000	---	501,000	---	---	1,500,000
(FDP)	EAGLE CREEK, KENTUCKY RIVER, KY........................	1,276,000	376,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	EASTERN KENTUCKY COMPREHENSIVE, KY.....................	---	---	---	---	400,000	---	---	---
(FC)	FRANKFORT (SOUTH FRANKFORT), KY........................	6,542,000	1,302,000	---	478,000	---	478,000	---	478,000
(N)	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY............................	3,550,000	875,000	225,000	---	950,000	---	225,000	---
(FC)	HAZARD, KY...	6,350,000	292,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FDP)	JACKSON, KY..	1,000,000	400,000	160,000	---	160,000	---	160,000	---
(N)	MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, IN & KY........................	292,000,000	927,000	---	1,700,000	---	1,948,000	---	1,700,000
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, KY............................	2,940,000	920,000	355,000	---	355,000	---	355,000	---
	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, BEARGRASS CREEK, KY..........	---	---	---	---	75,000	---	75,000	---
(N)	UNIONTOWN LOCKS AND DAM, KY............................	5,000,000	800,000	860,000	---	860,000	---	860,000	---
(FDP)	WEST LIBERTY, KY.......................................	600,000	75,000	225,000	---	225,000	---	225,000	---
	SAILING LINE, LOUISVILLE, KY...........................	---	---	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
	SALT RIVER BASIN, KY...................................	---	---	---	---	350,000	---	---	---
	SLAUGHTERS, KY...	50,000	---	---	---	---	---	50,000	---
	LOUISIANA								
(N)	ALGIERS LOCK, LA.......................................	3,928,000	470,000	570,000	---	570,000	---	570,000	---
(FC)	ALOHA RIGOLETTE, LA....................................	7,100,000	931,000	---	169,000	---	169,000	---	169,000
(FDP)	AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, LA........................	3,079,000	2,776,000	210,000	---	210,000	---	210,000	---
(FC)	COMITE RIVER, LA.......................................	18,000,000	700,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
(FC)	EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA............................	---	---	---	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000
(FDP)	GRAND & WHITE LAKES, LA................................	3,413,000	7,247,000	427,000	---	427,000	---	427,000	---
(FDP)	JEFFERSON - ORLEANS PARISHES URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA..	3,131,000	602,000	298,000	---	298,000	---	298,000	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	JEFFERSON PARISH (PUMPING STATION NO. 3), LA	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	LAKE CATAOUATCHE LEVEE, LA	1,762,000	376,000	396,000	---	396,000	---	396,000	---
(N)	PORT OF CAMERON, LA	608,000	150,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FC)	TANGIPAHOA, TCHEFUNCTE, AND TICKFAW RIVERS, LA	---	627,000	---	430,000	---	430,000	---	430,000
(FC)	WEST BANK - EAST OF HARVEY CANAL, LA	---	---	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
	MAINE								
(FDP)	ST. JOHN RIVER	400,000	---	---	---	---	---	400,000	---
(N)	WELLS HARBOR, ME	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
	MARYLAND								
(FDP)	ANACOSTIA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC	960,000	410,000	450,000	---	1,127,000	---	1,127,000	---
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES & CHANNELS, MD	905,000	113,000	207,000	---	207,000	---	207,000	---
(RCP)	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE REALLOCATION, MD & WV	483,000	300,000	183,000	---	183,000	---	183,000	---
	MASSACHUSETTS								
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR, MA	21,585,000	429,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000
(N)	HYANNIS HARBOR, BARNSTABLE, MA	500,000	150,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FC)	MASSACHUSETTS COASTAL, ROUGHANS POINT, REVERE, MA	8,970,000	1,035,000	---	260,000	---	260,000	---	260,000
(FC)	SAUGUS RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, MA	72,475,000	2,230,000	---	1,570,000	---	1,570,000	---	1,570,000
	MICHIGAN								
	BAY CITY, MI	---	---	---	---	120,000	---	---	---
	BOLLES HARBOR, MI	---	---	---	---	80,000	---	---	---
(RCP)	CLINTON RIVER SPILLWAY, MI	350,000	125,000	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
(FC)	ECORSE CREEK, MI	6,940,000	213,000	---	160,000	---	160,000	---	160,000
(N)	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	11,754,000	---	---	225,000	---	225,000	---	225,000
(RDP)	MENOMINEE RIVER, MI & WI	450,000	170,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
	MONROE HARBOR, MI	---	---	---	---	---	250,000	---	---
	ROUGE RIVER, MI	---	---	---	---	125,000	---	---	---
(N)	SAGINAW BAY AND RIVER MI	980,000	113,000	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
(N)	ST. JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	423,000	195,000	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
	MINNESOTA								
(FDP)	CROOKSTON, MN	905,000	490,000	290,000	---	290,000	---	290,000	---
(N)	GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHNLS & HBRS FINAL RPT, MN, MI.	8,960,000	385,000	---	210,000	---	210,000	---	210,000
(FC)	HOUSTON, MN	4,860,000	1,150,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FDP)	LITTLE FALLS, MN	645,000	100,000	110,000	---	110,000	---	110,000	---
(FDP)	RED LAKE & CLEARWATER RIVERS , MN	510,000	200,000	155,000	---	155,000	---	155,000	---
	MISSISSIPPI								
(FDP)	EAST FORK BASIN FISH & WILDLIFE RESTORATION, MS	375,000	---	82,000	---	82,000	---	82,000	---
(FDP)	JACKSON METROPOLITAN AREA, MS	2,115,000	735,000	660,000	---	660,000	---	660,000	---
(FDP)	PASCAGOULA RIVER BASIN, MS	2,628,000	2,226,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
	WOLF AND JORDAN RIVERS, MS	---	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	300,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	MISSOURI								
(FDP)	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO.	608,000	568,000	40,000	---	40,000	---	40,000	---
(FC)	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO.	11,250,000	---	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FDP)	CUIVRE RIVER AREA AND VICINITY, MO.	1,000,000	502,000	210,000	---	210,000	---	210,000	---
(FDP)	DARDENNE CREEK, MO.	987,000	255,000	160,000	---	160,000	---	160,000	---
(FDP)	DRY FORK AND EAST FORK, FISHING RIVER,MO.	536,000	175,000	70,000	---	70,000	---	70,000	---
(SPE)	JEFFERSON COUNTY, MO.	875,000	226,000	124,000	---	124,000	---	124,000	---
(FDP)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE UNIT, L-385	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	945,000
(RCP)	MRLS, UNIT L-246, CUTOFF LAKE, MO.	675,000	---	270,000	---	270,000	---	270,000	---
(FDP)	PLATTIN CREEK, MO.	700,000	303,000	160,000	---	160,000	---	160,000	---
(FDP)	ST. JOSEPH, MO AND VICINITY	881,000	288,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MO.	---	---	---	---	160,000	---	160,000	---
	ST. LOUIS HARBOR, MO & IL	---	---	---	---	---	900,000	---	500,000
(FDP)	WYACONDA RIVER BASIN, MO & IA.	400,000	113,000	97,000	---	97,000	---	97,000	---
	NEBRASKA								
(FDP)	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE.	446,000	251,000	121,000	---	121,000	---	121,000	---
	BURT - WASHINGTON COUNTIES, NE.	---	---	---	---	280,000	---	280,000	---
(FC)	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE.	6,300,000	113,000	---	234,000	---	234,000	---	234,000
	NEVADA								
(FDP)	LAS VEGAS WASH & TRIBS (DUCK CREEK), NV.	1,035,000	450,000	300,000	---	---	---	---	---
	LAS VEGAS WASH & TRIBS (DUCK CREEK - PITTMAN WASH), NV	---	---	---	---	500,000	---	575,000	---
(FDP)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, NV.	1,044,000	419,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	LOWER LAS VEGAS WASH WETLANDS, NV.	---	---	---	---	700,000	---	400,000	---
(FC)	TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV.	110,000,000	400,000	---	1,400,000	---	1,400,000	---	1,400,000
	NEW JERSEY								
	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL EXT - CARTERET, NJ & NY.	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(SP)	BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR, NJ (SHORE PROTEC	1,500,000	376,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	DE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ, TIOGA MARIN	2,230,000	199,000	---	70,000	---	70,000	---	70,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE NAVIGATION STUDY, NJ, PA.	7,035,000	6,938,000	97,000	---	97,000	---	97,000	---
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ, PA & DE.	286,330,000	425,000	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000
(FC)	LOWER SADDLE RIVER, NJ.	39,400,000	2,426,000	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000
	MANASQUAN RIVER, NJ.	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(FC)	MOLLY ANN'S BROOK AT HALEDON, PROSPECT PARK AND PATERS	15,500,000	992,000	---	340,000	---	340,000	---	340,000
	NY HARBOR & ADJACENT CHANNELS, CLAREMONT TERMINAL, NJ.	---	---	---	---	---	500,000	---	500,000
	NY HARBOR & ADJACENT CHANNEL, PORT JERSEY CHANNEL, NJ.	---	---	---	---	---	750,000	---	---
(FC)	PASSAIC RIVER MAINSTEM, NJ.	1,330,000,000	9,012,000	---	5,000,000	---	7,150,000	---	5,400,000
(FC)	RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ.	7,250,000	1,213,000	---	177,000	---	177,000	---	177,000
	RARITAN RIVER BASIN (DISMAL SWAMP), NJ.	---	---	---	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ.	211,309,000	7,166,000	---	2,600,000	---	3,169,000	---	2,600,000
	RARITAN BAY, NJ.	---	---	---	---	500,000	---	---	---
(N)	SALEM RIVER, NJ.	10,810,000	220,000	---	145,000	---	145,000	---	145,000
(SP)	TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ.	750,000	150,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	NEW MEXICO								
(FDP)	ALBUQUERQUE ARROYOS, NM	890,000	320,000	270,000	---	270,000	---	270,000	---
(FDP)	ESPANOLA VALLEY, NM, RIO GRANDE & TRIBS	820,000	226,000	90,000	---	90,000	---	90,000	---
(FDP)	LAS CRUCES, NM, EL PASO AND VICINITY	1,070,000	370,000	370,000	---	370,000	---	370,000	---
	RIO RANCHO, NM	330,000	---	---	---	---	---	330,000	---
(FC)	ROSWELL, PECOS RIVER, NM	21,200,000	36,000	---	380,000	---	380,000	---	380,000
	NEW YORK								
	BUFFALO SMALL BOAT HARBOR, NY	---	---	---	---	70,000	---	70,000	---
(SP)	LONG BEACH ISLAND, NY	1,135,000	550,000	285,000	---	285,000	---	285,000	---
	OLCOTT HARBOR, NY	---	---	---	---	---	425,000	---	425,000
(SPE)	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	980,000	435,000	225,000	---	225,000	---	225,000	---
	ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	---	---	---	---	175,000	---	---	---
(FC)	WESTCHESTER CTY STREAMS, SHELDRAKE R TOWN OF MAMARONEC	3,555,000	479,000	---	120,000	---	120,000	---	120,000
	PLUMB BEACH, BROOKLYN, NY	---	---	---	---	450,000	---	---	---
	WAPPINGERS LAKE, NY	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
	NORTH CAROLINA								
(N)	CAPE FEAR-NORTHEAST (CAPE FEAR) RIVER, NC	800,000	250,000	270,000	---	270,000	---	270,000	---
(SP)	DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC	625,000	188,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	DRUM INLET, NC	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
	EASTERN NORTH CAROLINA ABOVE CAPE LOOKOUT, NC	---	---	---	---	250,000	---	---	---
	FORT FISHER, NC	---	---	---	---	---	250,000	---	---
	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	---	---	---	---	---	500,000	---	---
(N)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	8,180,000	336,000	---	465,000	---	465,000	---	465,000
(FC)	SUGAR CREEK BASIN, NC & SC	29,200,000	678,000	---	626,000	---	626,000	---	626,000
(BE)	WEST ONSLOW BEACH & NEW RIVER INLET, NC	109,200,000	341,000	---	295,000	---	295,000	---	295,000
	WILMINGTON HARBOR - NORTHEAST (CAPE FEAR) RIVER, NC...	---	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	---
	WILMINGTON HARBOR OCEAN BAR, NC	---	---	---	---	---	1,000,000	---	400,000
(SP)	WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH - NORTH PORTION, NC	500,000	200,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
	NORTH DAKOTA								
(SPE)	DEVILS LAKE, ND	1,351,000	451,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	GRAND FORKS, ND	850,000	330,000	260,000	---	260,000	---	260,000	---
	OHIO								
(FDP)	BELMONT AND JEFFERSON COUNTIES, OH	700,000	300,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	CLINTON, OH	---	---	---	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	HOLES CREEK AT WEST CARROLLTON, OH	3,775,000	493,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN CINCINNATI, OH, KY & IN	1,008,000	941,000	67,000	---	67,000	---	67,000	---
(N)	OTTAWA RIVER HARBOR, OH	6,850,000	310,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000
(SPE)	TRUMBULL COUNTY, OH	500,000	150,000	160,000	---	160,000	---	160,000	---
(FDP)	VERMILION RIVER, OH	469,000	217,000	65,000	---	65,000	---	65,000	---
(FC)	WEST COLUMBUS LPP, OH	23,163,000	2,644,000	---	3,106,000	---	3,106,000	---	3,106,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	OKLAHOMA								
(FC)	FRY CREEKS, BIXBY, OK	12,700,000	1,503,000	---	312,000	---	312,000	---	312,000
	OREGON								
	AMAZON CREEK WETLANDS PROJECT	150,000	---	---	---	---	---	150,000	---
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR & WA	---	338,000	---	785,000	---	785,000	---	785,000
(FDP)	COLUMBIA SLOUGH, OR	659,000	188,000	141,000	---	141,000	---	141,000	---
(N)	COOS BAY, OR (DEEP DRAFT NAVIGATION)	9,999,000	---	---	455,000	---	455,000	---	455,000
(FDP)	JOHNSON CREEK, OR	756,000	398,000	230,000	---	230,000	---	230,000	---
(FDP)	WALLA WALLA RIVER, OR & WA	700,000	158,000	182,000	---	182,000	---	182,000	---
(FDP)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW STUDY, OR	1,650,000	600,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR	600,000	301,000	299,000	---	299,000	---	299,000	---
	PENNSYLVANIA								
(FC)	CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA - REALLOCATION	2,000,000	---	---	800,000	---	800,000	---	800,000
(FDP)	JUNIATA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, PA	320,000	120,000	120,000	---	120,000	---	120,000	---
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, PA	21,000,000	101,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
	LACKAWANNA RIVER GREENWAY CORRIDOR, PA	---	---	---	---	700,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	LEHIGH RIVER BASIN, PA	2,775,000	---	475,000	---	475,000	---	475,000	---
(N)	LOCKS AND DAM 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	390,000,000	25,000	---	1,400,000	---	2,300,000	---	1,400,000
(FDP)	RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA - REALLOCATION	420,000	290,000	130,000	---	130,000	---	130,000	---
	ROCHESTER, PA	---	---	---	---	---	50,000	---	50,000
(FDP)	SAW MILL RUN BASIN, PA	1,100,000	150,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	SAW MILL RUN, PA	7,125,000	780,000	---	340,000	---	340,000	---	340,000
(FDP)	SCHUYLKILL RIVER BASIN, POTTSTOWN AREA, PA	700,000	150,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	SCHUYLKILL RIVER BASIN, READING AREA, PA	700,000	75,000	225,000	---	225,000	---	225,000	---
	SOUTH BRANCH BLACKLICK CREEK, PA	---	---	---	---	150,000	---	---	---
(SPE)	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN FISH RESTORATION, PA, NY, & MD	700,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	WYOMING VALLEY LEVEE RAISING, PA	---	---	---	---	---	750,000	---	---
	PUERTO RICO								
(FC)	ARECIBO RIVER, PR	12,100,000	---	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(N)	GUAYANES, LAS MAREAS AND GUAYANILLA HARBORS, PR	402,000	67,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FC)	RIO DE LA PLATA, PR	41,800,000	1,091,000	---	700,000	---	700,000	---	700,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE DE LOIZA, PR	96,800,000	---	---	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000
(FDP)	RIO NIGUA AT SALINAS, PR	448,000	149,000	112,000	---	112,000	---	112,000	---
(FC)	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	227,000,000	5,833,000	---	892,000	---	892,000	---	892,000
(N)	SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	65,400,000	1,085,000	---	800,000	---	800,000	---	800,000
	RHODE ISLAND								
	BLOCK ISLAND HARBOR, RI	---	---	---	---	350,000	---	---	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	SOUTH CAROLINA								
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR DEEPENING	---	---	---	---	---	---	350,000	---
(BE)	MYRTLE BEACH, SC	185,000,000	1,269,000	---	1,166,000	---	1,166,000	---	1,166,000
(SP)	SOUTH CAROLINA SHORES, NORTH PORTION, SC	850,000	250,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
	SOUTH DAKOTA								
(FDP)	ABERDEEN AND VICINITY, SD	252,000	156,000	96,000	---	96,000	---	96,000	---
(SPE)	BIG BEND DAM - LAKE SHARPE (WILDLIFE RESTORATION), SD.	160,000	---	60,000	---	60,000	---	60,000	---
(FC)	BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD	6,300,000	---	---	280,000	---	280,000	---	280,000
(SPE)	JAMES RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL, SD	705,000	235,000	235,000	---	235,000	---	235,000	---
(SPE)	OAHE DAM - LAKE OAHE (WILDLIFE RESTORATION), SD	340,000	---	140,000	---	140,000	---	140,000	---
(FDP)	VERMILLION RIVER BASIN, SD	620,000	75,000	145,000	---	145,000	---	145,000	---
(FC)	WATERTOWN AND VICINITY, SD	8,460,000	38,000	---	314,000	---	314,000	---	314,000
	TENNESSEE								
	JACKSON AND TRENTON, TN	---	---	---	---	600,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN CHATTANOOGA-HAMILTON CO., TN	1,250,000	376,000	274,000	---	274,000	---	274,000	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF NASHVILLE, TN	1,710,000	760,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
	TEXAS								
(FC)	ABILENE, TX (BRAZOS RIVER BASIN)	21,000,000	258,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000
(FC)	ARROYO COLORADO, TX	4,800,000	358,000	---	380,000	---	380,000	---	380,000
(FC)	BEAL'S CREEK, BIG SPRING, TX	3,890,000	962,000	---	148,000	---	148,000	---	148,000
(FDP)	BOSQUE RIVER WATERSHED, TX	335,000	113,000	170,000	---	170,000	---	170,000	---
(FC)	BRAYS BAYOU (HOUSTON), TX	199,000,000	1,141,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	19,500,000	758,000	---	442,000	---	442,000	---	442,000
(FC)	CYPRESS CREEK, TX	119,000,000	778,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
(FC)	DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER PROJECT, TX..	97,000,000	2,146,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000
(FC)	FIVE MILE CREEK, DALLAS, TX	18,600,000	127,000	---	103,000	---	103,000	---	103,000
(RCP)	GIWW-ARANSAS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, TX	1,820,000	665,000	625,000	---	625,000	---	625,000	---
(N)	GIWW-SARGENT BEACH, TX	20,000,000	---	---	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000
(RCP)	GIWW-SARGENT BEACH, TX	1,700,000	1,290,000	410,000	---	410,000	---	410,000	---
(FDP)	GRAHAM, TX (BRAZOS RIVER BASIN)	710,000	280,000	110,000	---	110,000	---	110,000	---
(FC)	GREENS BAYOU (HOUSTON), TX	179,600,000	1,008,000	---	900,000	---	900,000	---	900,000
(FC)	HALLS BAYOU (HOUSTON), TX	67,800,000	---	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(N)	HOUSTON-GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	269,000,000	3,178,000	---	2,700,000	---	2,700,000	---	2,700,000
(FC)	HUNTING BAYOU (HOUSTON), TX	68,300,000	---	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FDP)	LOWER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	3,400,000	677,000	723,000	---	723,000	---	723,000	---
(SP)	MATAGORDA COUNTY SHORE, TX	640,000	160,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(N)	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,850,000	508,000	360,000	---	360,000	---	360,000	---
	PECAN BAYOU, TX	---	---	---	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
(N)	PORT LAVACA TO RED BLUFF, TX	440,000	100,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	RED RIVER, INDEX, AR TO DENISON DAM, TX	---	---	---	---	---	500,000	---	500,000
	RED RIVER WW, SHREVEPORT, LA TO DAINGERFIELD, TX	---	---	---	---	---	3,200,000	---	700,000
(FC)	SHOAL CREEK, AUSTIN, TX	76,500,000	331,000	---	750,000	---	750,000	---	750,000
(FC)	SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX	133,400,000	99,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000

Sitka, AK, Harbor project.—The Committee is aware of the need to begin preconstruction engineering and design for the Sitka Harbor project and directs the Corps of Engineers to expend $50,000 to undertake this work within available funds.

Wrangell Narrows/Dry Strait, AK.—An amount of $350,000 is recommended for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a reconnaissance study of the need to improve the navigation channel through Dry Strait in Alaska. The study will include a preliminary analysis of the needed navigation through Dry Strait and an economic analysis of the potential benefits of such a channel.

Flood control on Archey's Fork, AR.—The Corps is directed to use up to $300,000 of available funds to conduct a reconnaissance study of the flood control needs on Archey's Fork of the Little Red River, AR.

White River and tributaries, AR.—The Committee has provided $200,000, the full budget request, for the White River and tributaries study in Arkansas. The Corps is urged to take all action appropriate and necessary, within existing authorities to protect fishery habitat in the White River.

Pinal County AZ.—Recent and continuing urbanization in the nearby Phoenix and Tucson metropolitan area is causing increased pressure for land development in Pinal County in Arizona. A comprehensive approach to floodplain management is necessary to ensure wise floodplain use. In order to facilitate county floodplain management efforts, the Chief of Engineers is directed to use up to $500,000 of floodplain management services funding under section 206, to provide technical assistance and floodplain information to Pinal County, AZ.

Makena Beach, HI.—The Corps is directed to use up to $250,000 from within available funds to make an assessment of the feasibility of the purchase, maintenance and improvement of Makena Beach in Hawaii by the Corps of Engineers.

Slaughters, KY.—The Committee recommendation includes $50,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a reconnaissance study of the chronic flooding problems in the town of Slaughters, KY, under authority of section 205 flood control projects.

St. John River, ME.—The Committee has included $400,000 for the St. John River in Maine for the Corps of Engineers to determine if modifications to existing projects is required, and the advisability of providing further improvements to prevent flooding, particularly flooding caused by ice jams. In addition, the Corps is directed to provide appropriate technical assistance that may be necessary for ice control and ice breaking equipment.

Amazon Creek wetlands demonstration, OR.—The bill includes $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance report of the Amazon Creek wetland demonstration project in Oregon.

McKenzie River temperature control measures.—In accordance with the Corps' earlier determination that feasibility study cost sharing is not appropriate on the McKenzie River temperature control measures project in Oregon, the Committee directs the Corps to move expeditiously on the preparation and completion of the feasibility study. The Committee reserves the right to revisit and clarify any future issues regarding construction of the project.

Charleston, SC.—Funds in the amount of $350,000 are provided in the bill for the Corps to prepare a reconnaissance report on the need to deepen Charleston Harbor in order to accommodate the larger vessels currently operating in the world fleet.

Watertown and vicinity, SD.—The Committee supports the request for $314,000 for the Watertown and vicinity, SD, flood control study. However, concerns relative to the impacts of the proposed Mahoney Dam portion of the project have been brought to the attention of the Committee. Therefore, the Committee directs the Corps to limit the use of funds appropriated for fiscal year 1992 to the determination of the feasibility of the overall project.

Jackson and Trenton, TN.—The $600,000 included by the House for reconnaissance studies of flooding problems in the vicinity of Jackson and Trenton, TN, has been provided by the Committee under the "Mississippi River and tributaries" account.

Research and development.—The Committee recommends that the Corps of Engineers evaluate an innovative slotted wall erosion control technique to provide increased protection against erosion to coastal areas. The Corps should proceed with an independent assessment of the THS-WALL concept to be made by the Coastal Engineering Board, and, subject to a favorable independent assessment, up to $500,000 may be used for an R&D testing and demonstration program of the THS-WALL concept.

Section 22 planning assistance.—The Committee has been informed of the need for the State of Arizona to utilize continuous simulation model of rainfall and snowmelt runoff for application in the State's water resources planning program. The Committee is also aware that the Corps has the capability to provide the necessary technical assistance to the State of Arizona. The Committee urges the Corps to take into consideration Arizona's need in this regard when making allocations for planning assistance to States.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1991	$1,143,086,000
Budget estimate, 1992	1,222,357,000
House allowance	1,264,991,000
Committee recommendation	1,327,441,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,327,441,000 for construction of water resource projects of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

The following table shows each project for which funds are recommended. Immediately following the table, the Committee has outlined special reductions and changes made in the budgeted projects together with selected other Committee actions.

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
(FDP)	UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	4,560,000	1,493,000	1,200,000	---	1,200,000	---	1,200,000	---
	UTAH								
(FC)	UPPER JORDAN RIVER, UT	6,200,000	625,000	---	475,000	---	475,000	---	475,000
(FDP)	WEBER RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, UT	1,000,000	400,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	VIRGINIA								
(RCP)	AIWW BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA	650,000	311,000	339,000	---	339,000	---	339,000	---
(FC)	BUENA VISTA, VA	49,700,000	2,249,000	---	1,751,000	---	1,751,000	---	1,751,000
	RICHMOND FILTRATION PLANT, VA	---	---	---	---	---	950,000	---	---
(FDP)	UPPER JAMES RIVER BASIN, VA & WV	1,975,000	475,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(BE)	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	40,200,000	2,860,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000
	WASHINGTON								
(SPE)	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM POOL RAISE, WA	1,050,000	113,000	166,000	---	166,000	---	166,000	---
(RCP)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, ADDITIONAL WATER STORAGE, WA	989,000	420,000	237,000	---	237,000	---	237,000	---
	LA CONNER, WA	---	---	---	---	---	60,000	---	60,000
(RCP)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	648,000	188,000	112,000	---	112,000	---	112,000	---
(FDP)	LOWER SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	664,000	305,000	225,000	---	225,000	---	225,000	---
	NOOKSACK RIVER, WA	---	---	---	---	150,000	---	300,000	---
	SKAGIT RIVER, WA	---	---	---	---	150,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	TRI-CITIES LEVEES, WA	1,053,000	369,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
	WALLA WALLA DISTRICT DISPOSITION STUDY, WA	---	---	---	---	120,000	---	120,000	---
	WEST VIRGINIA								
(FC)	CABIN CREEK LPP, WV	11,450,000	431,000	---	135,000	---	135,000	---	135,000
(FC)	ISLAND CREEK AT LOGAN, WV	67,065,000	507,000	---	370,000	---	370,000	---	370,000
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, WV	11,069,000	9,376,000	995,000	---	995,000	---	995,000	---
(FC)	MOOREFIELD, WV	14,400,000	902,000	---	950,000	---	950,000	---	950,000
(FC)	PETERSBURG, WV	13,600,000	1,252,000	---	550,000	---	550,000	---	550,000
(SPE)	WEST VIRGINIA COMP STUDY, WV (OHIO RIV MI 40-317)	500,000	376,000	124,000	---	124,000	---	124,000	---
	WISCONSIN								
(FDP)	FOX RIVER CHANNEL GREEN BAY, WI	825,000	150,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	MILWAUKEE METROPOLITAN AREA, WI	720,000	245,000	275,000	---	275,000	---	275,000	---
(FC)	PORTAGE, WI	6,350,000	922,000	---	378,000	---	378,000	---	378,000
	WYOMING								
(FDP)	JACKSON HOLE RESTORATION, WY	1,150,000	338,000	212,000	---	212,000	---	212,000	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING	SENATE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	SENATE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	REVIEW OF AUTHORIZED PROJECTS								
	COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES..............	---	---	9,519,000	---	9,519,000	---	9,519,000	---
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA								
	MISCELLANEOUS								
	COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION...........................	---	---	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---
	CONSTRUCTION PRODUCTIVITY ADVANCEMENT RESEARCH (CPAR).	---	---	4,500,000	---	4,500,000	---	4,500,000	---
	DEVELOPMENT OF A FEDERAL INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY......	---	---	2,500,000	---	2,500,000	---	2,500,000	---
	ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF GLOBAL WARMING.....................	---	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA SYSTEMS.............................	---	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICE PRIVATIZATION....................	---	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES........................	---	---	7,100,000	---	7,100,000	---	7,100,000	---
	GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PLANS......................	---	---	---	---	1,500,000	---	---	---
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES.....................................	---	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES............................	---	---	700,000	---	700,000	---	700,000	---
	MAGNETIC LEVITATION TRANSPORTATION PILOT PROGRAM......	---	---	8,000,000	---	8,000,000	---	8,000,000	---
	NATIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT DURING DROUGHT..............	---	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATEHER SERVICE).....	---	---	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
	REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT..	---	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS..........	---	---	130,000	---	130,000	---	130,000	---
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)................	---	---	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS.................................	---	---	850,000	---	850,000	---	850,000	---
	TOTAL..			31,980,000	---	33,480,000	---	31,980,000	---
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT...............................	---	---	21,700,000	---	21,700,000	---	21,700,000	---
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS................			104,862,000	74,758,000	124,654,000	95,890,000	113,868,000	82,771,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE........	---	---	-19,278,000	---	-19,978,000	---	-20,428,000	---
	TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS...................			85,584,000	74,758,000	104,676,000	95,890,000	93,440,000	82,771,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:

(N)	NAVIGATION
(BE)	BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(FC)	FLOOD CONTROL
(MP)	MULTIPURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER
(SP)	SHORELINE PROTECTION
(FDP)	FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
(RCP)	REVIEW OF COMPLETED PROJECT
(RDP)	REVIEW OF DEFERRED PROJECT
(COMP)	COMPREHENSIVE
(SPEC)	SPECIAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	ALABAMA					
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	5,148,000	680,000	500,000	---	500,000
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, VICINITY OF JACKSO	2,394,000	291,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(N)	TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL &	71,000,000	18,546,000	10,000,000	15,000,000	10,000,000
(FC)	THREEMILE CREEK, MOBILE, AL	16,669,000	6,440,000	10,229,000	10,229,000	10,229,000
(FC)	VILLAGE CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY, AL	36,732,000	10,384,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
(N)	WILLIAM BACON OLIVER LOCK AND DAM, AL	118,000,000	97,122,000	11,810,000	11,810,000	11,810,000
	ALASKA					
(FC)	HOMER SPIT STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, AK	9,685,000	150,000	3,295,000	---	3,295,000
(N)	KODIAK HARBOR, AK	23,478,000	1,509,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
	ARIZONA					
(FC)	CLIFTON, AZ	8,480,000	3,538,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
(FC)	HOLBROOK, AZ	10,300,000	---	---	---	100,000
(FC)	PHOENIX ARIZONA AND VICINITY, AZ (STAGE 2)	226,700,000	200,166,000	20,650,000	20,650,000	22,650,000
	ARKANSAS					
(MP)	BEAVER LAKE, AR	5,410,000	1,248,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	FOURCHE BAYOU BASIN, LITTLE ROCK, AR	19,100,000	17,376,000	1,724,000	1,724,000	1,724,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN-KERR AR RIVER NAV SYSTEM, LOCKS AND DAMS, AR	633,900,000	572,685,000	13,700,000	15,460,000	15,460,000
	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	---	---	---	300,000	---
	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR & LA	87,400,000	---	---	5,800,000	7,300,000
	CALIFORNIA					
(FC)	CACHE CREEK SETTLING BASIN, CA	14,800,000	5,431,000	8,989,000	8,989,000	8,989,000
(FC)	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	361,700,000	322,766,000	6,450,000	6,450,000	6,450,000
(FC)	FAIRFIELD VICINITY STREAMS, CA	17,300,000	14,775,000	2,525,000	2,525,000	2,525,000
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	56,100,000	5,131,000	9,750,000	9,750,000	9,750,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAM GROUP, CA	73,100,000	10,045,000	2,780,000	2,780,000	2,780,000
	NEW MELONES LAKE, CA	394,500,000	---	---	2,000,000	---
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	59,600,000	14,049,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(N)	OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	3,900,000	---	---	---	3,100,000
(FC)	REDBANK AND FANCHER CREEK, CA	50,500,000	26,457,000	12,300,000	12,300,000	12,300,000
(N)	REDONDO BEACH, KING HARBOR, CA	5,130,000	4,709,000	421,000	421,000	421,000
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	12,500,000	4,202,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	101,000,000	80,466,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL, CA	22,500,000	9,131,000	5,900,000	5,900,000	5,900,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, CA (DEF CORR).	99,130,000	75,770,000	3,150,000	3,150,000	3,150,000
	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOD CONTROL PROJECT (GCID), CA	4,500,000	---	---	300,000	300,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO URBAN AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	24,750,000	17,380,000	7,370,000	7,370,000	7,370,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA	143,888,000	59,352,000	1,342,000	1,342,000	1,342,000
(FC)	SAN LUIS REY RIVER, CA	47,000,000	20,312,000	13,500,000	13,500,000	13,500,000
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	973,000,000	99,751,000	78,200,000	78,200,000	78,200,000
	SANTA PAULA CREEK CHANNEL, CA	37,100,000	---	---	800,000	800,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	SWEETWATER RIVER, CA..................................	34,000,000	29,959,000	4,041,000	4,041,000	4,041,000
(FC)	WILDCAT AND SAN PABLO CREEKS, CA.......................	15,070,000	11,562,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
(E)	YOLO BASIN WETLANDS, SACRAMENTO RIVER, CA.............	4,500,000	903,000	1,600,000	2,260,000	1,600,000
	DELAWARE					
(FC)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE.........................	15,500,000	3,934,000	165,000	165,000	165,000
	FLORIDA					
	BROWARD COUNTY (HOLLYWOOD/HALLANDALE BEACHES), FL.....	---	---	---	3,798,000	3,798,000
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL......................	936,000,000	368,596,000	14,000,000	14,100,000	14,000,000
(FC)	DADE COUNTY, FL.......................................	50,400,000	38,554,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL................................	6,665,000	2,709,000	3,956,000	3,956,000	3,956,000
(FC)	FOUR RIVER BASINS, FL.................................	164,000,000	71,627,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
	KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL...................................	---	---	---	5,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL..................................	58,140,000	---	---	---	400,000
	PALM BEACH COUNTY, DELRAY BEACH, FL...................	3,575,000	---	---	3,575,000	---
(BE)	PINELLAS COUNTY, FL...................................	107,000,000	16,442,000	6,400,000	6,400,000	6,400,000
(N)	PORT SUTTON CHANNEL, FL...............................	1,420,000	750,000	670,000	670,000	670,000
(BE)	SARASOTA COUNTY, FL...................................	31,800,000	4,425,000	7,775,000	7,775,000	7,775,000
	GEORGIA					
(FC)	OATES CREEK, RICHMOND COUNTY, GA......................	9,900,000	7,788,000	2,112,000	2,112,000	2,112,000
(MP)	RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM & LAKE, GA & SC................	552,000,000	519,951,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
	RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM & LAKE, WL MITIGATION, GA & SC.	---	---	---	10,000,000	10,000,000
	HAWAII					
(FC)	ALENAIO STREAM, HI....................................	7,730,000	1,019,000	1,870,000	---	1,870,000
(N)	KAWAIHAE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, HI........................	4,980,000	668,000	130,000	130,000	130,000
(N)	MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI..............................	8,000,000	987,000	1,620,000	1,620,000	1,620,000
	ILLINOIS					
(FC)	ALTON TO GALE ORGANIZED LEVEE DISTRICT, IL & MO (DEF C	107,485,000	95,052,000	3,103,000	3,103,000	3,103,000
(FC)	EAST ST LOUIS, IL.....................................	22,322,000	4,261,000	7,200,000	7,200,000	7,200,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY, 4 LOCKS, IL (REHAB)................	12,200,000	---	8,200,000	---	---
(FC)	LOVES PARK, IL..	19,200,000	2,859,000	265,000	265,000	265,000
(N)	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO....................	728,000,000	677,140,000	26,300,000	26,300,000	26,300,000
(N)	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, SECOND LOCK, IL & MO.......	210,800,000	135,592,000	46,000,000	46,000,000	46,000,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, DAMS 11-18, 21 & 22, IL, IA & MO (R	24,000,000	---	4,510,000	---	---
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, LOCK & DAM 15, IL & IA (REHAB).....	17,040,000	---	4,600,000	---	---
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, LOCKS & DAM 13, IL & IA (REHAB)....	13,000,000	---	2,100,000	---	---
(N)	OLMSTED LOCKS & DAM, IL & KY..........................	1,070,000,000	16,635,000	11,400,000	11,400,000	11,400,000
	O'HARE RESERVOIR, IL..................................	---	---	---	4,000,000	4,000,000
(N)	UPPER MISS RIVER SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROG, IL, IA, MO, MN.	255,384,000	46,379,000	19,455,000	19,455,000	19,455,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	INDIANA					
(FC)	EVANSVILLE, IN	51,100,000	43,125,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	63,800,000	6,769,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000
	IOWA					
	DES MOINES RECREATIONAL RIVER AND GREENBELT, IA	---	---	---	750,000	750,000
	MISSOURI RIVER F & WL MITIGATION, IA, NE, KS & MO	---	---	---	3,000,000	---
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS, & MO	119,462,000	89,823,000	945,000	945,000	945,000
(FC)	WEST DES MOINES - DES MOINES, IA	15,280,000	---	---	---	700,000
	KANSAS					
(FC)	GREAT BEND, KS	28,100,000	18,378,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
(FC)	HALSTEAD, KS	6,700,000	3,088,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
	KENTUCKY					
	SALYERSVILLE, KY	---	---	---	600,000	---
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	109,085,000	94,430,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
	LOUISIANA					
(FC)	ALOHA RIGOLETTE, LA	7,100,000	---	---	---	50,000
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	435,000,000	250,207,000	21,491,000	21,491,000	21,491,000
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	71,400,000	61,021,000	1,750,000	1,750,000	1,750,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA	533,000,000	93,581,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, L	138,000,000	12,877,000	8,133,000	8,133,000	8,133,000
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	164,500,000	113,325,000	12,400,000	12,400,000	12,400,000
(FC)	PEARL RIVER, SLIDELL, ST TAMMANY PARISH, LA	20,800,000	3,356,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
	RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, LA, AR, & TX	---	---	---	2,300,000	2,300,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	1,739,000,000	1,194,064,000	38,291,000	73,681,000	123,681,000
(FC)	WESTWEGO TO HARVEY CANAL, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	58,600,000	6,476,000	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
	MASSACHUSETTS					
(BE)	REVERE BEACH, MA	6,695,000	4,258,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
(FC)	TOWN BROOK, QUINCY AND BRAINTREE, MA	29,550,000	1,990,000	8,550,000	8,550,000	8,550,000
	MINNESOTA					
(FC)	BASSETT CREEK, MN	28,200,000	23,843,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	CHASKA, MN	26,600,000	11,756,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
(N)	DULUTH SUPERIOR CHANL EXTENSION, MN & WI	9,295,000	1,291,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LOCKS & DAMS 2-10, MN, WI & IA (REHA	17,489,000	---	8,220,000	---	---
(FC)	ROCHESTER, MN	88,400,000	28,323,000	12,400,000	12,400,000	12,400,000
(FC)	ST PAUL, MN	11,700,000	2,138,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	MISSISSIPPI					
(N)	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	30,302,000	2,495,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(FC)	SOWASHEE CREEK, MERIDIAN, MS	14,880,000	11,324,000	3,556,000	3,556,000	3,556,000
(FC)	TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MS & AL	39,970,000	24,754,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
	MISSOURI					
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	181,000,000	48,006,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
(FC)	BRUSH CREEK, KANSAS CITY, MO	19,485,000	3,320,000	5,170,000	5,770,000	5,770,000
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU-JACKSON, MO	25,580,000	6,616,000	10,300,000	10,300,000	10,300,000
(FC)	HANNIBAL, MO	5,150,000	4,780,000	370,000	370,000	370,000
(MP)	HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	549,400,000	541,916,000	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000
(FC)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, VALLEY PARK LEVEE, MO	10,566,000	621,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	212,000,000	151,283,000	5,700,000	5,700,000	5,700,000
	NEBRASKA					
(FC)	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD	21,000,000	2,101,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	59,700,000	56,110,000	3,590,000	3,590,000	3,590,000
	NEW HAMPSHIRE					
(N)	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER, NH & ME	13,419,000	10,744,000	2,675,000	2,675,000	2,675,000
	NEW JERSEY					
(N)	BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	31,200,000	27,399,000	3,801,000	3,801,000	3,801,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER IN THE VIC OF CAMDEN, NJ (BECKETT ST. T	4,500,000	3,221,000	1,279,000	1,279,000	1,279,000
(FC)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET & PECK BEACH, NJ	430,000,000	2,770,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
	RARITAN AND SANDY HOOK BAYS, NJ	---	---	---	700,000	---
(BE)	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	633,000,000	18,948,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000
	NEW MEXICO					
(FC)	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	60,900,000	5,850,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	ALAMOGORDO, NM	27,300,000	2,188,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
(FC)	ALBUQUERQUE NORTH DIVERSION CHANNEL, NM (DEF CORR)	19,570,000	17,770,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE, NM	41,100,000	---	---	---	3,000,000
	NEW YORK					
(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NEW YORK CITY, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON PT., NY	36,000,000	---	---	---	2,000,000
(N)	HEMPSTEAD HARBOR, NY	6,670,000	2,532,000	4,138,000	4,138,000	4,138,000
(N)	KILL VAN KULL AND NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, NY & NJ	310,000,000	109,445,000	28,500,000	30,000,000	28,500,000
	NY HARBOR COLLECTION AND REMOVAL OF DRIFT, NY & NJ	---	---	---	2,500,000	2,500,000
(N)	SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	16,900,000	9,226,000	631,000	631,000	631,000
(FC)	YONKERS, NY (DEF CORR)	13,529,000	13,374,000	155,000	155,000	155,000

Mill Creek, Fort Smith, AR.—In 1988, the Congress provided funding to begin construction of the Mill Creek, Fort Smith, AR, project under the section 205 program of the Corps of Engineers. The Committee directs that sufficient continuing funding be provided for the project in fiscal 1991 if needed.

Montgomery Point Lock, McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system, AR.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,760,000 to be used to accelerate engineering and design for the proposed Montgomery Point Lock and Dam.

Bethel, AK.—The Committee is aware of a dangerous bank stabilization situation in Bethel, AK, which seriously threatens city, State, and Federal property, as well as a tank farm which supplies fuel oil and petroleum products to 70 percent of western Alaska villages. The Committee has approved those portions of the Bethel project considered to be an emergency and directs the Corps to use such funds as may be necessary under the "Construction general" appropriation to accomplish the needed work.

Phoenix and vicinity, AZ.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,000,000 for the Phoenix and vicinity project in Arizona for covering the Arizona Canal Diversion Channel through the cities of Phoenix and Paradise Valley, AZ, and to make the project aesthetically compatible with the surrounding environment. The cost sharing to be applied for the covering shall be that used for the Phoenix, AZ, and vicinity project. The local sponsor shall be responsible for any additional lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and disposal areas required for the covering, as well as a cash contribution of 2.3 percent of the separable costs of the covering.

Guadalupe River, CA.—The Committee understands that the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works is currently reviewing a revised general design memorandum for the Guadalupe River flood control project in California. The Committee feels that it is important that a completed GDM which presents an accurate picture of the revised Guadalupe project be provided in a timely manner so that an informed decision can be made regarding reauthorization of the project.

Therefore, the Secretary of the Army for Civil Works is directed to complete his review and make his recommendation to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate, on the Guadalupe River project at the earliest possible time, but not later than October 1, 1991.

Oakland Harbor, CA.—The Committee is aware that delays in the initiation of construction on the Oakland Harbor deepening project continue to threaten efficient and safe shipping operations into the Port of Oakland. For these reasons, the Committee directs that the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, immediately undertake the authorized dredging of the Oakland Inner Harbor to a depth of 38 feet using available funds. The dredge material should be suitable for marine disposal and the Committee's preference is for disposal at a site known as the 103 site secured by the Department of the Navy for construction of projects authorized for channel dredging at the Alameda Naval Air Station and the Oakland Naval Supply Center. Such action should be carried out in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, and other applicable Federal and State laws. The Secretary is further directed to maintain channel depths sufficient to permit free and safe movement of vessels until such time as the balance of the Oakland Harbor project is constructed; provided, however, that the dredge materials from the remaining increment of the project shall be disposed of consistent with the long-term management strategy for San Francisco Bay dredging.

If the Secretary determines, after consulting with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, that disposal at the aforementioned 103 site cannot be completed in time to permit the timely initiation of construction on the deepening of the Oakland Inner Harbor, the Committee directs the Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to use available funds to dredge the Oakland Inner Harbor, to a depth of 38 feet, and dispose of that portion of the dredge material suitable for marine disposal as necessary to conduct such dredging at the currently permitted Alcatraz disposal site; provided, that the disposal of such materials shall be within the volume limits established for the management of the Alcatraz site and will not create significant, additional adverse environmental impacts; and, further provided, that the balance of the dredge materials from the Oakland Harbor project shall be disposed of consistent with the long-term management strategy for San Francisco Bay dredging. If the Corps exercises this option, it shall also be carried out in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, and other applicable Federal and State law.

The Committee also directs the Corps of Engineers to initiate the planning, engineering, design, and environmental work necessary for the development of the so-called Sonoma Bay wetland restoration demonstration project. The project is projected to have the capacity for handling in excess of 2 million cubic yards of dredge material and would be a valuable, alternative dredge disposal site for the Oakland Harbor project and the bay area in general.

Owensboro, KY, streambank erosion problems.—The Committee directs the Corps' attention to the need for streambank erosion measures along the Ohio River in the vicinity of Owensboro, KY, and has provided sufficient funds under the section 14 Streambank Erosion Control Program to address the problem.

Grand Isle and vicinity, hurricane protection, LA.—The Committee is aware of interim emergency protective works constructed by the town of Grand Isle in advance of the Corps of Engineers' Grand Isle and vicinity project. The Committee has included language in the bill which permits the Corps to reimburse the town of Grand Isle for the interim measures carried out by the town in connection with the Grand Isle project.

Lake Pontchartrain and vicinity, LA.—As previously recognized by the Congress in the conference report for the Water Resources Development Act of 1990, the original barrier plan did not address the problems associated with the Lake Pontchartrain tidal basin outfall canals. These problems must be resolved in completing the high-level plan. One option under consideration is the construction of structures which will close the outfall canals at London and Orleans Avenues during periods of hurricane activity. However, this option does not address the issues surrounding the tidal basin/outfall canals, which must be able to function during a major storm or hurricane. These outfall canals are an integral part of the overall New Orleans area flood protection plan and the existing parallel protection levees need to be raised to levels sufficient to confine the standard project hurricane and to function properly in their normal and traditional manner.

The Committee does not believe it was the intent of Congress in authorizing this project to compound flooding or drainage problems in the city of New Orleans. Therefore, the Committee has included language in the bill that directs the Corps to treat the outfall canals as an authorized project feature of the overall hurricane protection project, and further directs the Corps to raise the levees along the entire lengths of the London Avenue and Orleans Avenue canals to grades sufficient to confine a standard project hurricane with costs to be borne by both the Federal and local assuring authorities in accordance with the cost-sharing arrangement of 70 percent Federal cost participation and 30 percent local cost participation.

The Committee recommends an extension of the date upon which the non-Federal sponsors, the Lake Borgne basin levee district, LA, would resume repayment responsibilities for the St. Bernard Parish portion of this project until December 1992 to allow the Congress and the Corps the appropriate time to evaluate the study of expected benefits as authorized in Public Law 101-640, section 116(k), of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990.

Ouachita River levees, LA.—The Committee provided $400,000 for the current year for the Ouachita River levees project in Louisiana for the Corps of Engineers to initiate work to rehabilitate or replace deteriorated drainage structures in the levees, including the Bawcomville portion of the protective system. The Committee understands that the Corps has sufficient funds available to allow the project to proceed with design and construction of project features.

Again, it is the Committee's opinion that the project should proceed in an orderly, but expeditious manner. If additional resources are needed to maintain schedules, the Corps is directed to reprogram the necessary funds to accomplish the required work.

Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, LA.—The Committee has included a total of $123,681,000 to continue construction of the Red River Waterway project in Louisiana. The additional funds have been provided to continue construction of locks and dams 4 and 5, and to initiate the following continuing contracts in fiscal year 1991 which are not to be considered fully funded: Carroll Capout, Cupples Capout, Sunny Point revetment and dikes, Curtis revetment, and Eagle Bend revetment extending from approximately mile 274.5 to mile 269; and to continue McDade revetment, Moss revetment, Elm Grove revetment, and Cecile revetment. The Committee recommendation includes up to $1,000,000 for planning and acquisition of mitigation lands in the vicinity of Bayou Bodcau area for the mitigation of fish and wildlife losses.

Missouri National Recreation River, NE and SD.—The Committee understands that the Corps of Engineers is currently involved in a section 7, Endangered Species Act consultation with the U.S.

Fish and Wildlife Service on the least tern and piping plover along the Missouri River. Until this consultation is completed and an agreement is reached with the Fish and Wildlife Service concerning the management of the Missouri National Recreation River project, there is little likelihood that the Corps could obtain required permits needed to undertake stabilization or construction work.

Therefore, the Committee has provided the full budget request of $50,000 for the Corps to continue to coordinate with FWS, habitat enhancement and to participate in rewriting the management plan by the National Park Service. If conditions change and additional work can be accomplished in fiscal year 1992, the Corps is urged to reprogram additional funding to the project.

Cochiti Lake, NM.—The Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers and the Pueblo de Cochiti have completed a joint recommendation for solution of the wetfields problem below Cochiti Dam, NM. The Committee is further aware that additional losses to the Pueblo can be minimized by the timely completion of the project. The Committee directs the Secretary of the Army to expend funds in the amount of $300,000 to complete final designs and specifications for construction of the drain system on the Pueblo de Cochiti, NM. These funds shall be used to obtain field surveys, obtain and review additional subsurface data necessary to complete the design, and to coordinate the final design and specifications with the Tribal Council of the Pueblo.

The Committee has included $2,500,000 for the Missouri River, Fort Yates Bridge project in North Dakota and language in the bill requiring bridge construction.

Onondaga Creek and Harbor, NY.—The Committee has included a provision in the bill directing the Secretary of the Army to use $1,000,000 of appropriated funds in the bill to rehabilitate Onondaga Creek and Harbor pursuant to section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, as amended, in order to maintain a minimum flow, control high water flows within the city of Syracuse, and to reduce high flow velocities on Onondaga Creek.

Skiatook Lake, OK.—Notwithstanding House Report 101-536, the Committee directs that up to $1,200,000 appropriated in fiscal year 1991 to provide potable water to recreation areas to Skiatook Lake, OK, be used by the Corps to fund high priority recreation improvements at Skiatook Lake.

Columbia River endangered salmon, Oregon and Washington.—Within the funds provided for Corps construction, the Committee directs that the Corps spend $500,000 for environmental studies and other investigations associated with the pending endangered salmon petitions and the salmon summit.

Willow Creek Dam, OR.—In fiscal year 1991, the Committee provided $150,000 to construct improvements to recreation facilities at Willow Creek Dam in Oregon. The Committee is concerned that the local cost share, while currently secured, could be jeopardized by long delays in the development of the project. Accordingly, the Committee urges the Corps to move ahead as expeditiously as possible to complete the project.

Bayou Latanier, Krotz Springs, LA.—The Committee has been advised by local officials of the continued serious drainage and pollution problems on Bayou Latanier at Krotz Springs, LA, which have resulted from the construction of the Atchafalaya River levee system. The Committee has included $100,000 to complete restoration and improvement of Bayou Latanier.

Connecticut River Basin, Townshend and Ball Mountain Dams, VT.—An amount of $600,000, the full budget request, is provided for the Connecticut River basin, Townshend and Ball Mountain Dams in Vermont. The Corps should take all reasonable measures to complete the project in 1992 and to reprogram any additional funds needed to accomplish the work.

Sequoyah Hills Park, TN.—Within available funds, the Secretary of the Army is directed to use $150,000 to provide streambank protection measures along the bank of the Tennessee River adjacent to the Sequoyah Hills Park in Knoxville under the authority of section 14 of Public Law 79-526.

Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy and Upper Cumberland Rivers, KY, VA, and WV.—The Committee has amended the House bill to provide $62,770,000 for the Levisa and Tug Forks project. The recommendation includes $17,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the lower Mingo County, WV, and $9,000,000 for Matewan, WV features of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy and Upper Cumberland Rivers project. Funding has also been provided for the Corps to undertake the following specific project reports: McDowell County, WV, upper Mingo County, WV, Wayne County, WV, Tug Fork Tributaries, WV, the Upper Tug Fork, WV, and Pike County, KY.

The Committee recommendation for fiscal 1992 also includes $20,500,000 for levee and floodwall construction, and structural and nonstructural work at Barbourville, KY, and Harlan, KY. These are the amounts needed by the Corps of Engineers in 1992 for activities at these two locations.

Continuing authorities programs.—The Committee has rejected the administration's proposal to phase out sections 14, 103, 107, 111, and 208 of the Corps of Engineers' continuing authorities programs. These programs have proven to be of great value and are particularly important in providing assistance to many small communities throughout the Nation.

Accordingly, language has been included in the bill directing the Secretary of the Army to continue the planning, engineering, design, and construction of projects under all sections of the continuing authorities programs. Because these projects are small in scope, the Committee does not object to the initiation of new construction in fiscal year 1992.

Small navigation projects (sec. 107).—Within the appropriation recommended for section 107, small navigation projects, the Committee has included $235,000 for the Corps to undertake the Wood Island Harbor project in Maine.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

Appropriations, 1991	$344,606,000
Budget estimate, 1992	346,550,000
House allowance	353,437,000
Committee recommendation	353,437,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $353,437,000 for flood control activities along the Mississippi River and its tributaries.

The Committee understands that the Corps of Engineers has sufficient funds for the Ouachita River levees project in Louisiana to complete design and begin construction in fiscal year 1992. Given the importance of this project to a large portion of central Louisiana, it is essential that the Corps take the necessary actions to expedite the project. If additional funds are needed in fiscal year 1992, the Corps is directed to reprogram available funds into the project.

Dyersburg boat ramp, TN.—Within available funds the Corps may use not to exceed $225,000 to construct a boat ramp near Dyersburg, in Dyer County, TN.

Jackson and Trenton, TN.—The Committee has included $600,000 in the bill for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete reconnaissance studies of recurrent flooding problems in the vicinity of Jackson and Trenton, TN.

The following table shows the distribution of the funds recommended with the budget request and the House allowance for activities and projects under this account.

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	NORTH CAROLINA					
(N)	AIWW-REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES, NC	72,400,000	26,999,000	7,900,000	7,900,000	7,900,000
(FC)	B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	144,800,000	140,009,000	3,200,000	3,264,000	3,264,000
(FC)	CAROLINA BEACH AND VICINITY, NC	17,600,000	10,295,000	797,000	797,000	797,000
(FC)	FALLS LAKE, NC	183,000,000	160,886,000	8,700,000	9,000,000	8,700,000
	NORTH DAKOTA					
	MISSOURI RIVER, FORT YATES BRIDGE	---	---	---	---	2,500,000
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER, ND	45,700,000	17,189,000	2,840,000	2,840,000	2,840,000
(FC)	SOURIS RIVER BASIN, ND	95,200,000	59,574,000	15,565,000	15,565,000	15,565,000
	OHIO					
(FC)	MILL CREEK, OH	163,000,000	87,449,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
(FC)	RENO BEACH HOWARD FARMS, OH	5,344,000	3,101,000	2,150,000	2,150,000	2,150,000
(FC)	SENECAVILLE LAKE, MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH (DAM SAFET	2,800,000	1,919,000	825,000	825,000	825,000
	OKLAHOMA					
(FC)	MINGO CREEK, OK	101,900,000	21,465,000	13,900,000	13,900,000	13,900,000
	OREGON					
(N)	BONNEVILLE NAVIGATION LOCK, OR & WA	329,000,000	218,298,000	82,000,000	82,000,000	82,000,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE, OR & WA (REHAB)	18,127,000	---	8,699,000	---	---
(MP)	BONNEVILLE SECOND POWERHOUSE, OR & WA	680,000,000	661,751,000	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000
(FC)	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	168,400,000	103,435,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR & WA...	25,600,000	20,958,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
	PENNSYLVANIA					
(N)	GRAYS LANDING, LOCK AND DAM 7, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA..	171,200,000	75,621,000	34,500,000	34,500,000	34,500,000
(FC)	LOCK HAVEN, PA	63,900,000	14,493,000	17,100,000	17,100,000	17,100,000
(N)	POINT MARION, LOCK AND DAM 8, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA &.	96,400,000	42,861,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT)	57,950,000	7,731,000	4,369,000	4,369,000	4,369,000
(FC)	TURTLE CREEK, PA	20,001,000	16,815,000	3,186,000	3,186,000	3,186,000
	PUERTO RICO					
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	362,450,000	271,192,000	17,600,000	15,013,000	15,013,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA					
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	61,875,000	30,853,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
	FOLLY BEACH, SC	12,386,000	---	---	---	600,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	TENNESSEE					
(MP)	CENTER HILL DAM, TN (DAM SAFETY)	14,700,000	700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
	TEXAS					
(N)	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	19,400,000	2,150,000	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK, TX	61,000,000	12,152,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
(FC)	COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS, TX	138,000,000	115,586,000	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
(FC)	EL PASO, TX	109,500,000	74,833,000	9,300,000	9,300,000	9,300,000
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	60,000,000	33,308,000	6,560,000	6,560,000	6,560,000
(FC)	JOE POOL LAKE, TX	188,200,000	187,258,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	LAKE WICHITA, HOLLIDAY CREEK AT WICHITA FALLS, TX	31,000,000	25,979,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(N)	MOUTH OF COLORADO RIVER, TX	29,900,000	26,621,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	297,000,000	284,621,000	5,400,000	7,800,000	7,800,000
	RED RIVER BASIN CHLORIDE CONTROL, TX & OK	---	---	---	3,000,000	---
(MP)	SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX (DAM SAFETY)	38,200,000	600,000	950,000	950,000	950,000
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	132,000,000	109,176,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000
(FC)	SIMS BAYOU AT HOUSTON, TX	192,000,000	8,265,000	7,100,000	7,100,000	7,100,000
(FC)	TAYLORS BAYOU, TX	38,500,000	30,063,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
	UTAH					
(FC)	LITTLE DELL LAKE, UT	32,700,000	28,960,000	3,740,000	3,740,000	3,740,000
	VERMONT					
(FC)	CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN, TOWNSHEND & BALL MOUNTAIN DAM	1,500,000	400,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
	VIRGINIA					
(FC)	RICHMOND, VA	91,700,000	47,529,000	29,500,000	29,500,000	29,500,000
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	21,300,000	2,751,000	470,000	770,000	770,000
	WASHINGTON					
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH ADDITIONAL UNITS, WA	396,000,000	390,863,000	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER JUVENILE FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID	250,000,000	44,768,000	31,700,000	31,700,000	31,700,000
(N)	GRAYS HARBOR, WA	41,600,000	14,530,000	12,700,000	12,700,000	12,700,000
(MP)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	218,000,000	179,916,000	13,100,000	13,100,000	13,100,000
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA (DAM SAFETY)	60,200,000	20,257,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000
(FC)	ZINTEL CANYON DAM, WA	8,212,000	3,679,000	4,533,000	4,533,000	4,533,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	WEST VIRGINIA					
(FC)	EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	86,286,000	37,886,000	48,400,000	48,400,000	48,400,000
(N)	GALLIPOLIS LOCKS AND DAM, WV & OH	346,000,000	216,848,000	38,000,000	38,000,000	38,000,000
(FC)	LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	924,800,000	342,255,000	13,200,000	33,700,000	62,770,000
(N)	WINFIELD LOCK AND DAM, WV	210,000,000	39,568,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
	WISCONSIN					
(FC)	STATE ROAD AND EBNER COULEES, WI	26,400,000	14,244,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
	MISCELLANEOUS					
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL (1965 ACT)	---	---	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
	BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 103)	---	---	800,000	3,000,000	1,500,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14).	---	---	6,700,000	10,000,000	8,000,000
	EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION	---	---	16,828,000	16,828,000	16,828,000
	FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	---	---	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - BOARD EXPENSES	---	---	30,000	30,000	30,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - CORPS EXPENSES	---	---	160,000	70,000	70,000
	MITIGATION OF SHORE DAMAGES (SECTION 111)	---	---	---	500,000	500,000
	NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107)	---	---	2,700,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
	PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME	---	---	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
	SECTION 933 1986 WRDA	---	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
	SMALL SNAGGING & CLEARING PROJECTS (SECTION 208)	---	---	---	500,000	500,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	---	---	-151,597,000	-194,089,000	-206,089,000
	TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL			1,222,357,000	1,264,991,000	1,327,441,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:

(N) NAVIGATION
(BE) BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(MP) MULTIPURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1991	$1,450,669,000
Budget estimate, 1992	1,514,935,000
House allowance	1,547,855,000
Committee recommendation	1,537,265,000

An appropriation of $1,537,265,000 is recommended for the operation and maintenance activities of the Army Corps of Engineers.

The Committee fully recognizes the budget crises, yet believes that it is essential to provide adequate attention to operation and maintenance requirements in order to protect the large Federal investment. It should be pointed out that OMB has reduced this area significantly over the past 3 years below the amount needed to adequately address program needs. Meanwhile, the Corps has been completing projects and adding them to the operational inventory each year. In order to cope with this situation, the Corps has had to defer or delay scheduled maintenance activities. If the trend in deferred maintenance continues unabated, Corps managed national infrastructure will experience accelerating deterioration until failure occurs. The Committee finds this situation unacceptable.

As alluded to earlier, the Committee is aware of growing operation and maintenance requirements nationwide, and the continuously changing needs and priorities. It is often necessary to accomplish work scheduled for the budget year in the current year, and it is not uncommon for the Corps to divert budgeted operation and maintenance funds to unscheduled work to meet unforeseen emergency requirements.

Further, the Committee is aware of the efforts of the Corps to stretch its scarce O&M dollars to cover all of its projects and to effect savings through a variety of methods. As more and more projects come into the inventory and budgetary constraints reduce available resources, it is clear the Corps will need to change its traditional approach to undertaking the required O&M work nationwide. Adjustments in lower priority programs and noncritical work should be considered in conjunction with efforts to optimize the use of the limited resources available and to maximum public benefits.

Heber Springs, AR.—With the construction of Greers Ferry Lake in 1961, the city of Heber Springs, AR, lost its water supply along the Little Red River. Since this time, the Corps of Engineers and the city of Heber Springs have been negotiating a reasonable amount of compensation for the city. The city has been getting water from Greers Ferry Lake in exchange for the water supply lost with its construction. The Committee directs the Secretary to allow for the free use of water currently withdrawn by the city on an average annual basis, and also to establish an amount to be used free of cost that will cover the reasonable growth of the city until the year 2000.

McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system, pool 2/Morgan Bendway.—The Committee directs the Corps' attention to the need to excavate the Arkansas-White River Canal to its full depth and to deposit the fill material resulting from this excavation at Morgan Bendway. This excavation is crucial if the Corps is to be able to operate pool 2 to move sediments through the system and to greatly reduce annual dredging costs. The Corps is directed to provide the necessary operation and maintenance funds for this purpose.

St. George Harbor, AK.—The Committee is informed that the entrance channel of St. George Harbor, AK, has not been dredged to project depth. The Corps of Engineers is directed to expend available funds to undertake dredging work that will clear the channel to project depth.

Lake Sakakawea, ND.—The Committee recommendation includes $50,000 to address mosquito larviciding due to extremely low water levels at Lake Sakakawea.

Lorain, OH, lighthouse.—Within available funds, the Committee recommends that up to $500,000 may be made available for foundation work at the Lorain, OH, lighthouse under authority of section 943 of Public Law 99-662 and section 110(a) (1) and (2) of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

Broken Bow Lake, OK.—The Committee has included bill language authorizing the Chief of Engineers to release water from Broken Bow Lake, OK, for the Mountain Fork trout fishery for a period of 2 years. The Committee intends that this temporary extension of authority be sufficient to allow the fishery to continue operation until Congress considers permanent reallocation of the water supply at Broken Bow Lake.

Port Orford, OR.—The Committee has been informed of a heavy shoaling condition which exists along the face of the dock in the vicinity of the boat hoist at Port Orford, OR, and directs the Corps of Engineers to provide additional dredging as needed.

Columbia and Snake Rivers, port dredging, Oregon and Washington.—The Committee understands that the Corps of Engineers in cooperation with the affected States, Bonneville Power Administration, Bureau of Reclamation, Indian tribes, and other affected river users, and consistent with the agreements reached by the salmon summit, has developed and begun to implement a plan designed to facilitate the outmigration of anadromous fish which includes substantially changing river flows and the operation of the projects on both the Snake and Columbia Rivers for extended periods of time at lower reservoir levels. The Committee is concerned that the operation of the projects on the Columbia/Snake River system at these lower pool levels may prohibit navigation access from the channel and operation of existing cargo handling facilities. Failure to preserve our current export facilities at these current operating levels could substantially damage U.S. export capabilities. Therefore, the Committee has included language in the bill providing, on a one-time basis, for maintenance dredging to ensure the operation of these facilities on the Columbia/Snake Rivers system at depths commensurate with the authorized main navigation channel. In view of the time-sensitive nature of this work, and the short timeframe available in which the dredging can be done, the Committee expects the Corps to use its existing fiscal year 1991 funds to the extent necessary to do the essential preparatory work required for this operation for the remainder of the current fiscal year.

Charleston Harbor, rediversion, SC.—The Committee has included $4,500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to modify and monitor operations of the fish lift at the Cooper River, Charleston Harbor rediversion project in South Carolina. These modifications are required in order to protect important environmental resources and maintain a critical sport fishing industry by increasing the number of blue back herring passing into the Santee Cooper Lakes.

Monitoring of the fish lift operation for 2 years after modifications is required to gather and analyze baseline data to be used to refine the operation of the fish lift and to ensure its effectiveness, and is estimated to cost $550,000. The project and facilities were originally constructed at full Federal expense, therefore, these modifications to correct and improve the fish passage facilities should be constructed under the same conditions.

North Springfield Reservoir, North Hartland Lake, and Union Village Dam, VT.—The Corps is directed to use up to $250,000 of the funds included in the bill for the North Springfield, North Hartland, and the Union Village projects to address silt loading, access problems, bank stabilization, and fish and wildlife restoration and enhancement needs at these projects.

Fox River, WI.—The Committee has included language in the bill to require the Secretary of the Army to continue, for 1 year, to operate and maintain the Fox River project in Wisconsin in a caretaker status and to concurrently continue to negotiate a fair, reasonable, and orderly transfer of responsibilities and ownership of the project to the State of Wisconsin and other non-Federal interest in the State. The Corps is directed to report to the Committee on the results of the negotiations at the end of the years extension.

Wetlands Research Program.—The Committee again expresses concern regarding earmarking funds for a specific demonstration project. The Committee feels strongly that this is a national program and should be managed and carried out with a national perspective. The central purpose of the Wetlands Research Program is to combine the environmental and engineering disciplines to provide the best technical, most cost-effective tools and methods to meet Corps and national needs. The information and techniques that will be developed in this program will be widely shared through coordination and cooperative efforts with other Federal and State agencies and a vigorous program of information dissemination and transfer.

Therefore, in order to get the best information and data, proposals should go through a vigorous review and evaluation process prior to selection. Earmarking of funds for specific demonstrations without adequate review, weakens the program, reduces the availability of quality data, and in the end results in greater costs to the Government.

The Committee, while not providing funding for the Coastal America Partnership Program, believes that the goals and objectives should be incorporated into existing ongoing wetland research and demonstration activities.

The Committee expects the Corps to coordinate their coastal programs with other Federal agencies and coastal States to ensure that coastal living resource protection and management activities are undertaken in a coordinated, cost-effective, and comprehensive way.

Shoreline management program.—The Committee understands that, in some locations, local lake associations or similar entities are interested in assisting the Corps of Engineers in administration of the shoreline management program at Corps lakes and that the Secretary of the Army's Office believes that this arrangement could have merit. Therefore, the Corps is directed to evaluate this proposal and develop a voluntary plan which would allow management of the shoreline management permit program for docks and vegetation modification by local lake management associations or State or local governments.

Small Business Competitive Demonstration Program.—The Committee is disappointed that the Secretary of the Army has failed to implement as yet its instructions in report No. 101–378 on this subject.

The Committee reiterates this clear instruction. The Committee reminds the Corps of Engineers that the 1988 Small Business Act requires the Department of the Army to make every reasonable effort to award the increased set-aside percentages. The Committee finds it unreasonable to apply the percentages to the total annual funds awarded for the performance of work by sea-going hopper dredges, because the small business industry does not own or operate this type of equipment.

The Secretary of the Army is further directed: (a) to conduct a pilot program during fiscal years 1991 and 1992 to include the computation of the annual monetary goals for the small business concerns using the total annual funds awarded for the performance of the work which is actually performed with the plant available to the small business dredging firms. The pilot program statistics, along with the statistics consistent with the provisions of Public Law 100–656, will be utilized by the Committee to make an assessment of the actual impact of the annual monetary goals on the entire dredging industry. The necessity for the pilot program is predicated on an understanding that the equipment available to the small concerns cannot perform a significant volume of the annual dredging workload, for example, offshore entrance channels and large-scale projects requiring the removal of rock and the transportation of dredged material for long distances in open-water areas; (b) in order to ensure that the rule of two guidelines are applied uniformly nationwide and to eliminate the award of set-aside jobs when only one bid is submitted by the small business firms, a procedure shall be implemented immediately which will require that all small business firms submitting bids for the performance of dredging contracts shall provide the contracting officer with written documentation stating a commitment to bid at least 30 days prior to the bid opening date. Further, the documentation shall also include the name and location of the dredge(s) and attendant plant to be used and certification that the plant is in operational condition and available to perform the work. Prior to making an award, the contracting officer shall make a determination as to whether the specified plant is available and suitable to perform the work within the time period included in the specifications and consistent with the channel dimensions required for safe and efficient passage of the maritime traffic.

This is an item of special interest to the Committee and requires a reprogramming action if the Corps deviates from this instruction in any way. The Committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide the Committee with a report within 30 days of its plan to implement this instruction.

The Committee intends to work closely with the authorizing committees for the Corps and with the Senate Committee on Small Business to seek permanent changes in the set-aside program to safeguard the budgetary integrity of the Corps dredging program and its important mission.

In addition, the attention of the Corps of Engineers is directed to the following projects in need of maintenance or review and for which the Committee has received requests—dredging of deposits that block access to the Chena River from the Tanana River in Alaska.

The following table is included for illustrative purposes only and shows the estimated work allowances for fiscal year 1992.

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
ALABAMA		
ALABAMA - COOSA RIVER COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY, AL	1,704,000	1,704,000
ALABAMA - COOSA RIVER, AL	4,927,000	6,400,000
BAYOU CODEN, AL	595,000	595,000
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	15,813,000	18,000,000
DAUPHIN ISLAND BAY, AL	224,000	224,000
FLY CREEK, AL	225,000	225,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	3,603,000	3,603,000
MILLERS FERRY LOCK & DAM - WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LAK	3,724,000	3,724,000
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	16,066,000	16,836,000
PERDIDO PASS CHANNEL, AL	707,000	707,000
ROBERT F. HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	3,229,000	3,229,000
TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	15,995,000	18,000,000
WALTER F. GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	6,051,000	6,051,000
ALASKA		
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	1,932,000	1,932,000
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	1,033,000	1,108,000
CRAIG HARBOR	404,000	404,000
DILLINGHAM SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK	721,000	721,000
HOMER SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK	396,000	396,000
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	232,000	232,000
NOME HARBOR, AK	556,000	556,000
ARIZONA		
ALAMO DAM, AZ	989,000	989,000
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	771,000	771,000
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	83,000	83,000
ARKANSAS		
BEAVER LAKE, AR	5,920,000	5,920,000
BLAKELY MT DAM - LAKE OUACHITA, AR	3,615,000	3,615,000
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	888,000	888,000
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	4,433,000	4,433,000
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	6,440,000	6,440,000
DEGRAY LAKE, AR	3,304,000	3,304,000
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	973,000	973,000
DIERKS LAKE, AR	886,000	886,000
GILLHAM LAKE, AR	918,000	918,000
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	4,445,000	4,445,000
HELENA HARBOR, AR	469,000	469,000
MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR.	24,071,000	24,071,000
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	2,036,000	2,036,000
NARROWS DAM - LAKE GREESON, AR	3,084,000	3,084,000
NIMROD LAKE, AR	1,142,000	1,142,000
NORFORK LAKE, AR	3,351,000	3,351,000
OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	590,000	575,000
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	6,100,000	6,100,000
OZARK-JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	3,955,000	3,955,000
WHITE RIVER, AR	2,171,000	2,171,000
CALIFORNIA		
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	1,648,000	1,648,000
BUCHANAN DAM - H.V. EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,297,000	1,297,000
CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	145,000	145,000
COYOTE VALLEY DAM - (LAKE MENDOCINO), CA	2,011,000	2,011,000
CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA	1,538,000	1,538,000
DRY CREEK - WARM SPRINGS LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	2,493,000	2,493,000
FARMINGTON DAM, CA	130,000	130,000
FISHERMAN'S WHARF AREA, CA	290,000	290,000
HIDDEN DAM - HENSLEY LAKE, CA	1,302,000	1,302,000
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	2,880,000	2,880,000
ISABELLA LAKE, CA	589,000	589,000
LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	155,000	155,000
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	2,586,000	2,986,000
MERCED COUNTY STREAM GROUP, CA	168,000	168,000
MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	223,000	223,000
MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	88,000	88,000
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	1,898,000	1,898,000
NEW MELONES LAKE, CA	770,000	770,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	287,000	287,000
NOYO RIVER & HARBOR, CA	34,000	34,000
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	2,734,000	2,734,000
OCEANSIDE EXPERIMENTAL SAND BYPASS SYSTEM, CA	1,300,000	1,300,000
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	836,000	2,000,000
PETALUMA RIVER, CA	3,280,000	3,280,000
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	1,680,000	1,680,000
PORT SAN LUIS, CA	1,108,000	1,108,000
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	2,355,000	2,355,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	838,000	838,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER - SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	75,000	75,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA.	777,000	777,000
SAN DIEGO HARBOR, CA	326,000	326,000
SAN FRANCISCO BAY - DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	2,301,000	2,301,000
SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, CA	2,419,000	2,719,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA	2,015,000	2,015,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	1,585,000	1,585,000
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	1,388,000	1,388,000
SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	1,445,000	1,445,000
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	2,070,000	2,070,000
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	795,000	995,000
SUCCESS LAKE, CA	1,385,000	1,385,000
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	1,015,000	1,015,000
TERMINUS DAM (LAKE KAWEAH), CA	1,471,000	1,471,000
VENTURA HARBOR, CA	3,215,000	3,215,000
YUBA RIVER, CA	33,000	33,000
COLORADO		
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	352,000	352,000
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	832,000	832,000
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	444,000	444,000
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	1,535,000	1,535,000
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	807,000	807,000
CONNECTICUT		
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	246,000	246,000
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	294,000	294,000
CONNECTICUT RIVER BELOW HARTFORD, CT	624,000	624,000
GUILFORD HARBOR, CT	514,000	514,000
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	237,000	237,000
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	682,000	682,000
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	449,000	449,000
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	252,000	252,000
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	338,000	338,000
THOMASTON DAM, CT	372,000	372,000
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	455,000	455,000
DELAWARE		
CHESAPEAKE AND DELAWARE CANAL, ST. GEORGES BRIDGE REPL	14,000,000	14,000,000
INDIAN RIVER INLET AND BAY, DE	1,640,000	1,640,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CHINCOTEAGUE BAY TO DELAWARE BA	18,000	18,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DE RIVER TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, DE.	17,030,000	17,030,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, D	32,000	32,000
MISPILLION RIVER, DE	957,000	957,000
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	2,911,000	2,911,000
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
ANACOSTIA RIVER BASIN, DC	198,000	198,000
POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC	596,000	596,000
POTOMAC RIVER BELOW WASHINGTON, DC	222,000	222,000
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	216,000	216,000
FLORIDA		
AIWW, NORFOLK TO ST. JOHNS RIVER, FL, GA, SC, NC, & VA	1,946,000	1,946,000
APALACHICOLA BAY, FL	737,000	737,000
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	3,763,000	3,763,000
CARRABELLE HARBOR, FL	263,000	263,000
CENTRAL & SOUTHERN, FL	5,465,000	5,465,000
CHARLOTTE HARBOR, FL	554,000	554,000
CLEARWATER PASS, FL	500,000	500,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
CROSS FLORIDA BARGE CANAL, FL	1,969,000	1,969,000
EAST PASS CHANNEL, FL	742,000	742,000
ESCAMBIA-CONECUH RIVERS, FL	8,000	8,000
FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	2,475,000	2,475,000
FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	346,000	346,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R. TO ANCLOTE R.	321,000	321,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	2,158,000	2,158,000
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	1,816,000	1,816,000
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA.	4,914,000	4,914,000
MIAMI HARBOR, FL	504,000	504,000
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	2,399,000	2,399,000
OKLAWAHA RIVER, FL	77,000	77,000
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	1,196,000	1,196,000
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	305,000	305,000
PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	504,000	504,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	2,869,000	2,869,000
ST. LUCIE INLET, FL	714,000	714,000
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	2,758,000	2,758,000
WITHLACOOCHIE RIVER, FL	221,000	221,000
GEORGIA		
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	7,584,000	7,584,000
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &	4,156,000	4,156,000
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (SAVANNAH DISTRICT), GA	868,000	868,000
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	3,182,000	3,182,000
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	5,383,000	5,383,000
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	3,883,000	5,883,000
HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	6,909,000	6,909,000
J. STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	8,289,000	8,289,000
RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM & LAKE, GA & SC	4,322,000	4,322,000
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	5,253,000	5,253,000
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	137,000	137,000
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	4,830,000	4,830,000
HAWAII		
BARBER'S POINT HARBOR, HI	57,000	57,000
HONOLULU HARBOR, HI	292,000	292,000
IDAHO		
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	3,748,000	3,748,000
DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	6,413,000	6,413,000
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	1,008,000	1,008,000
ILLINOIS		
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL	558,000	558,000
CARLYLE LAKE, IL	3,544,000	3,544,000
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	1,948,000	1,948,000
CHICAGO RIVER, IL	1,386,000	1,386,000
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	222,000	222,000
ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL & IN	16,428,000	16,428,000
ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL (LMVD PORTION)	1,584,000	1,584,000
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,567,000	1,567,000
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	3,961,000	3,961,000
MISS RIVER BTWN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS, IL, MN	80,728,000	80,728,000
MISS RVR BTWN MO RIVER & MINNEAPOLIS, IL & MN (LMVD PO	11,744,000	11,744,000
REND LAKE, IL	3,339,000	3,339,000
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	941,000	941,000
INDIANA		
BEVERLY SHORES, IN	22,000	22,000
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	714,000	714,000
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	701,000	701,000
BURNS WATERWAY SMALL BOAT HARBOR, IN	122,000	122,000
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	542,000	542,000
CECIL M. HARDEN LAKE, IN	511,000	600,000
HUNTINGTON LAKE, IN	469,000	469,000
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	535,000	535,000
MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	138,000	138,000
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	483,000	483,000
MONROE LAKE, IN	513,000	513,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
PATOKA LAKE, IN..	468,000	468,000
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN.......................................	519,000	519,000
IOWA		
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA......................................	2,722,000	3,000,000
MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA..	52,000	52,000
MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS & MO.	7,312,000	7,312,000
RATHBUN LAKE, IA...	1,910,000	1,910,000
RED ROCK DAM - LAKE RED ROCK, IA........................	3,922,000	3,922,000
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA.....................................	3,985,000	3,985,000
SMALL NAV PROJ AT SIOUX CITY, IA........................	5,000	5,000
KANSAS		
CLINTON LAKE, KS...	1,355,000	1,355,000
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS...................................	849,000	849,000
EL DORADO LAKE, KS.......................................	503,000	503,000
ELK CITY LAKE, KS..	772,000	772,000
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS......................................	1,120,000	1,120,000
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS.......................................	915,000	915,000
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS.....................	1,687,000	1,687,000
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS.......................................	1,262,000	1,262,000
MARION LAKE, KS..	903,000	903,000
MELVERN LAKE, KS...	1,629,000	1,629,000
MILFORD LAKE, KS...	1,908,000	1,908,000
PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS....................	989,000	989,000
PERRY LAKE, KS...	1,997,000	1,997,000
POMONA LAKE, KS..	1,482,000	1,482,000
TORONTO LAKE, KS...	366,000	366,000
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS....................................	1,545,000	1,545,000
WILSON LAKE, KS..	1,316,000	1,316,000
KENTUCKY		
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY.......................	5,730,000	5,730,000
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY....................................	1,185,000	1,185,000
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY.....................................	1,031,000	1,031,000
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY..	707,000	707,000
CARR FORK LAKE, KY.......................................	930,000	930,000
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY..	561,000	561,000
DEWEY LAKE, KY...	947,000	947,000
ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY.......................	524,000	524,000
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY..	1,179,000	1,179,000
GRAYSON LAKE, KY...	860,000	860,000
GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY.............................	1,362,000	1,362,000
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY.....................................	1,246,000	1,246,000
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY.......................................	1,420,000	1,420,000
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY....................................	1,124,000	1,124,000
LICKING RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY....................	15,000	15,000
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY....................................	603,000	603,000
MIDDLESBORO, KY..	120,000	120,000
NOLIN LAKE, KY...	1,294,000	1,294,000
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV....	15,460,000	15,460,000
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV.	3,266,000	3,266,000
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY.....................................	659,000	659,000
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY.....................................	1,482,000	1,482,000
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY....................................	682,000	682,000
WOLF CREEK DAM - LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY...................	6,133,000	6,133,000
YATESVILLE LAKE KY......................................	704,000	704,000
LOUISIANA		
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	4,127,000	4,127,000
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA...............................	1,403,000	1,403,000
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA..............................	370,000	370,000
BAYOU PIERRE, LA...	38,000	38,000
BAYOU TECHE, LA..	142,000	142,000
CADDO LAKE, LA...	96,000	96,000
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA............................	9,423,000	9,423,000
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA.....................................	849,000	849,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA..........................	13,513,000	13,513,000
HOUMA NAVIGATION CHANNEL, LA............................	241,000	241,000
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA..............................	272,000	272,000
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA.................................	71,000	71,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BENEFIT COST RATIO	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	CURRENT YEAR ALLOCATION	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS							
	SURVEYS:							
	GENERAL STUDIES:							
(FDP)	SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS STUDY, AR.......................		1,880,000	524,000	179,000	215,000	215,000	215,000
(FDP)	ALEXANDRIA, LA.......................................		1,465[illegible]00	287,000	287,000	233,000	233,000	233,000
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA, MS................................		3,000,[illegible]00	1,000,000	---	300,000	300,000	300,000
(FDP)	ST. FRANCIS RIVER, FISH AND WILDLIFE, AR & MO.....		1,300,000	570,000	350,000	230,000	230,000	230,000
(FDP)	JACKSON AND TRENTON, TN.............................		600,000	---	---	---	---	600,000
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA..................		---	---	---	280,000	280,000	280,000
	PRECONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING AND DESIGN:							
(FC)	EASTERN ARKANSAS REGION (COMPREHENSIVE STUDY), AR.		228,000,000	412,000	412,000	420,000	420,000	420,000
(FC)	HELENA & VICINITY, AR................................	1.40	14,200,000	1,275,000	550,000	225,000	225,000	225,000
(FC)	LOWER WHITE RIVER, BIG CREEK & TRIBUTARIES, AR....	2.20	49,800,000	1,797,000	385,000	308,000	308,000	308,000
(FC)	WHITEMAN'S CREEK, AR.................................	1.50	5,300,000	400,000	287,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.................					2,511,000	2,511,000	3,111,000
	CONSTRUCTION							
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN......	26.80	3,600,000,000	1,986,728,000	101,140,000	109,500,000	109,500,000	109,500,000
(N)	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR.....................	2.30	33,800,000	6,057,000	766,000	6,200,000	6,200,000	6,200,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.	26.80	1,360,000,000	657,282,000	21,061,000	21,800,000	21,800,000	21,800,000
(FC)	ST. FRANCIS RIVER BASIN, AR & MO.......................	1.05	381,000,000	297,191,000	9,760,000	9,670,000	9,670,000	9,670,000
(FC)	WEST MEMPHIS & VICINITY, AR............................	1.30	11,000,000	3,183,000	2,000,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA.................	26.80	125,000,000	41,599,000	10,626,000	9,700,000	9,700,000	9,700,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA..................................	28.20	1,530,000,000	662,704,000	30,621,000	25,800,000	25,800,000	25,800,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI & LOUISIANA ESTAURINE AREAS, MS & LA......	1.30	53,000,000	4,193,000	191,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA...........................	5.00	64,200,000	21,849,000	2,076,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA..................		160,600,000	66,544,000	1,771,000	4,630,000	4,630,000	4,630,000
(FC)	HORN LAKE CREEK & TRIBUTARIES (INCL. COW PEN CREEK), M	3.20	2,120,000	1,011,000	236,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
(FC)	SARDIS DAM, MS (DAM SAFETY)............................		29,300,000	6,873,000	531,000	440,000	440,000	440,000
	YAZOO BASIN, MS:		(1,355,432,000)	(398,850,000)	(31,966,000)	(31,775,000)	(31,775,000)	(31,775,000)
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS..............................		126,000,000	49,615,000	4,402,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
(FC)	DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL, MS....................		102,000,000	73,261,000	11,889,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS..		210,000,000	34,380,000	---	25,000	25,000	25,000
(FC)	REFORMULATION UNIT, MS...............................		15,000,000	11,540,000	5,646,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS......................................		252,000,000	86,920,000	8,239,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
(FC)	UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS.............................		435,332,000	79,367,000	830,000	2,350,000	2,350,000	2,350,000
(FC)	YAZOO BACKWATER FOWL F&WL MITIGATION LANDS, MS....		6,900,000	4,906,000	800,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	YAZOO BACKWATER, MS..................................		208,200,000	58,861,000	160,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
(FC)	MEMPHIS HARBOR (ENSLEY BERM), TN......................	1.90	23,100,000	21,364,000	1,627,000	925,000	925,000	925,000
(FC)	NONCONNAH CREEK, TN & MS...............................	2.40	18,400,000	5,742,000	2,499,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
(FC)	WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN.........................	.84	114,000,000	40,877,000	893,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
	SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION...........................					237,490,000	237,490,000	237,490,000
	MAINTENANCE							
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN......		---	---	---	65,860,000	65,860,000	65,860,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BENEFIT COST RATIO	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	CURRENT YEAR ALLOCATION	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER - NORTH BANK, AR		---	---	---	810,000	810,000	810,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER - SOUTH BANK, AR		---	---	---	164,000	164,000	164,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.		---	---	---	7,100,000	7,100,000	7,100,000
(FC)	ST. FRANCIS RIVER BASIN, AR & MO		---	---	---	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF & TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA		---	---	---	2,729,000	2,729,000	2,729,000
(FC)	WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR		---	---	---	800,000	800,000	800,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA		---	---	---	10,007,000	10,007,000	10,007,000
(FC)	BATON ROUGE HARBOR - DEVIL SWAMP, LA		---	---	---	230,000	230,000	230,000
(FC)	BAYOU COCODRIE & TRIBS, LA		---	---	---	120,000	120,000	120,000
(FC)	BONNET CARRE, LA		---	---	---	805,000	805,000	805,000
(FC)	LOWER RED RIVER - SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA		---	---	---	50,000	50,000	50,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION - CAERNARVON, LA		---	---	---	188,000	188,000	188,000
(FC)	OLD RIVER, LA		---	---	---	4,197,000	4,197,000	4,197,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA		---	---	---	2,620,000	2,620,000	2,620,000
(N)	GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS		---	---	---	361,000	361,000	361,000
(N)	VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS		---	---	---	249,000	249,000	249,000
	YAZOO BASIN, MS:		---	---	---	(15,339,000)	(15,339,000)	(15,339,000)
(FC)	ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS		---	---	---	2,204,000	3,272,000	3,272,000
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER, MS		---	---	---	170,000	170,000	170,000
(FC)	ENID LAKE, MS		---	---	---	2,785,000	4,168,000	4,168,000
(FC)	GREENWOOD, MS		---	---	---	580,000	580,000	580,000
(FC)	GRENADA LAKE, MS		---	---	---	2,973,000	4,137,000	4,137,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS		---	---	---	898,000	3,216,000	3,216,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, MS		---	---	---	2,581,000	3,535,000	3,535,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS		---	---	---	988,000	988,000	988,000
(FC)	WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS		---	---	---	410,000	410,000	410,000
(FC)	YAZOO BACKWATER, MS		---	---	---	359,000	359,000	359,000
(FC)	YAZOO CITY, MS		---	---	---	1,391,000	1,391,000	1,391,000
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO		---	---	---	3,220,000	3,220,000	3,220,000
(N)	MEMPHIS HARBOR (MCKELLAR LAKE), TN		---	---	---	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS		---	---	---	1,206,000	1,206,000	1,206,000
(FC)	MAPPING		---	---	---	819,000	819,000	819,000
	SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE					128,174,000	135,061,000	135,061,000
	REDUCTION FOR SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE		---	---	---	-21,625,000	-21,625,000	-22,225,000
	TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES					346,550,000	353,437,000	353,437,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:
(N) NAVIGATION
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(FDP) FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	1,572,000	1,572,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER - BATON ROUGE TO GULF OF MEXICO, LA.	46,117,000	49,117,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA	15,666,000	19,166,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	1,659,000	1,659,000
RED RIVER WATERWAY - MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT,.	6,743,000	6,743,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	1,585,000	1,585,000
WALLACE LAKE, LA	181,000	181,000
MAINE		
KENNEBEC RIVER, ME	647,000	647,000
SACO RIVER, ME	747,000	747,000
MARYLAND		
BALTIMORE HARBOR & CHANNELS, MD & VA	11,236,000	11,236,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD	329,000	329,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	365,000	365,000
CHESTER RIVER	785,000	785,000
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	82,000	82,000
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	1,282,000	1,282,000
KNAPPS NARROWS, MD	559,000	559,000
OCEAN CITY HARBOR & INLET & SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	383,000	383,000
TWITCH COVE AND BIG THOROFARE RIVER, MD	573,000	573,000
WICOMICO RIVER, MD	201,000	201,000
MASSACHUSETTS		
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	485,000	485,000
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	433,000	433,000
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	347,000	347,000
CAPE COD CANAL, MA	10,501,000	10,501,000
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREAS, MA	163,000	163,000
CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	151,000	151,000
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	328,000	328,000
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	331,000	331,000
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	519,000	519,000
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	512,000	512,000
NEW BEDFORD, FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER,	283,000	283,000
TULLY LAKE, MA	444,000	444,000
WEST HILL DAM, MA	447,000	447,000
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	396,000	396,000
MICHIGAN		
ALPENA HARBOR, MI	224,000	224,000
ARCADIA HARBOR, MI	87,000	87,000
BLACK RIVER HARBOR, MI	87,000	87,000
BOLLES HARBOR, MI	216,000	216,000
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST. CLAIR, MI	196,000	196,000
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	156,000	156,000
CLINTON RIVER, MI	59,000	59,000
DETROIT RIVER, MI	5,001,000	5,001,000
FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	302,000	302,000
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	1,211,000	1,211,000
HAMMOND BAY HARBOR, MI	120,000	120,000
HARBOR BEACH HARBOR,MI	3,726,000	3,726,000
HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	1,135,000	1,135,000
INLAND ROUTE, MI	18,000	18,000
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	1,166,000	1,166,000
LELAND HARBOR, MI	172,000	172,000
LEXINGTON HARBOR, MI	141,000	141,000
LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI	172,000	172,000
LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	2,092,000	2,092,000
MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	945,000	945,000
MANISTIQUE HARBOR, MI	494,000	494,000
MARQUETTE HARBOR, MI	283,000	283,000
MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI	90,000	90,000
MONROE HARBOR, MI	1,129,000	1,129,000
MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	887,000	887,000
NEW BUFFALO HARBOR, MI	135,000	135,000
ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	4,283,000	4,283,000
PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	158,000	158,000
PORT SANILAC HARBOR, MI - MITIGATION OF SHORE DAMAGE..	36,000	36,000
PRESQUE ISLE HARBOR, MI	389,000	389,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
ROUGE RIVER, MI	93,000	93,000
SAGINAW RIVER, MI	2,124,000	2,124,000
SAGINAW RIVER, MI-DIKE DISPOSAL	356,000	356,000
SEBEWAING RIVER (ICE JAM REMOVAL), MI	13,000	13,000
SEBEWAING RIVER, MI	338,000	338,000
ST. CLAIR RIVER, MI	457,000	457,000
ST. JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	1,181,000	1,181,000
ST. MARYS RIVER, MI	12,339,000	12,339,000
WHITE LAKE HARBOR, MI	274,000	274,000
MINNESOTA		
BIGSTONE LAKE, WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	156,000	156,000
DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	3,122,000	3,122,000
GRAND MARAIS HARBOR, MN	155,000	155,000
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	393,000	393,000
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	165,000	165,000
ORWELL LAKE, MN	247,000	247,000
RED LAKE RIVER, MN	90,000	90,000
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	2,176,000	2,176,000
TWO HARBORS, MN	418,000	418,000
MISSISSIPPI		
BILOXI HARBOR, MS	627,000	627,000
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	3,000	3,000
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	16,000	16,000
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	2,470,000	2,470,000
MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	169,000	169,000
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,717,000	1,717,000
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	4,902,000	4,902,000
PEARL RIVER, MS	145,000	145,000
ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	339,000	339,000
YAZOO RIVER, MS	4,000	4,000
MISSOURI		
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	389,000	389,000
CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	4,846,000	4,846,000
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	2,042,000	2,042,000
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	8,854,000	8,854,000
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	812,000	812,000
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	648,000	648,000
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	10,721,000	10,721,000
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	1,718,000	1,718,000
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,232,000	1,232,000
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO	93,000	93,000
STOCKTON LAKE, MO	4,086,000	4,086,000
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	6,144,000	6,144,000
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	100,000	100,000
MONTANA		
FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	3,126,000	3,126,000
LIBBY DAM, MT	4,331,000	4,331,000
MISSOURI R BTWN FORT PECK DAM, MT & GAVINS PT DAM, SD.	---	1,500,000
NEBRASKA		
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS & CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	5,280,000	5,280,000
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	1,472,000	1,472,000
MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATION RIVER	---	200,000
MISSOURI R MASTER MANUAL REVIEW, NE, IA, KS, MO, MT, N	973,000	973,000
PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	623,000	623,000
SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	615,000	615,000
NEVADA		
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	335,000	335,000
PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS DAMS, NV	100,000	100,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
BLACKWATER DAM, NH	324,000	324,000
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	339,000	339,000
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	470,000	470,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
HOPKINTON-EVERETT LAKES, NH	953,000	953,000
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	442,000	442,000
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	395,000	395,000
NEW JERSEY		
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	650,000	650,000
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	1,238,000	1,238,000
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	3,906,000	3,906,000
DELAWARE RIVER-PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE	14,048,000	14,048,000
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	1,621,000	1,621,000
NEWARK BAY HACKENSACK & PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	1,890,000	1,890,000
RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ	123,000	123,000
RARITAN RIVER, NJ	133,000	133,000
SALEM RIVER, NJ	680,000	680,000
SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	129,000	129,000
SHOAL HARBOR & COMPTON CREEK, NJ	135,000	135,000
NEW MEXICO		
ABIQUIU DAM, NM	1,683,000	1,683,000
COCHITI LAKE, NM	1,586,000	1,886,000
CONCHAS LAKE, NM	806,000	806,000
GALISTEO DAM, NM	281,000	281,000
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	362,000	362,000
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	892,000	892,000
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	294,000	294,000
NEW YORK		
ALMOND LAKE, NY	341,000	341,000
ARKPORT DAM, NY	191,000	191,000
BAYRIDGE & RED HOOK CHANNELS, NY	110,000	110,000
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	2,396,000	2,396,000
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	1,448,000	1,448,000
BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	500,000	500,000
CONEY ISLAND CREEK, NY	712,000	712,000
EAST CHESTER CREEK, NY	635,000	635,000
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	867,000	867,000
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	303,000	303,000
FIRE ISLAND TO JONES INLET, NY	1,849,000	1,849,000
FLUSHING BAY & CREEK, NY	118,000	118,000
GOWANUS CREEK CHANNEL, NY	78,000	78,000
GREAT SOUTH BAY, NY	800,000	800,000
HEMPSTEAD HARBOR, NY	1,121,000	1,121,000
HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	795,000	795,000
HUDSON RIVER, NY	2,759,000	2,759,000
LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY	1,043,000	1,043,000
MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	1,362,000	1,362,000
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, NY & VT	40,000	40,000
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	3,108,000	4,108,000
NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY	4,022,000	4,022,000
NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	659,000	659,000
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	5,013,000	5,013,000
NEWTOWN CREEK, NY	78,000	78,000
NORTHPORT HARBOR, NY	84,000	84,000
PORT JEFFERSON HARBOR, NY	135,000	135,000
ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	800,000	800,000
SHINNECOCK INLET	260,000	260,000
SOUTHERN NEW YORK PROJECTS, NY	1,743,000	1,743,000
TARRYTOWN HARBOR, NY	832,000	832,000
WESTCHESTER CREEK, NY	78,000	78,000
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	357,000	357,000
NORTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (WILMINGTON DISTRICT),	6,207,000	6,207,000
B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,017,000	1,017,000
BEAUFORT HARBOR, NC	415,000	415,000
BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	711,000	711,000
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	966,000	966,000
CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	575,000	575,000
CHANNEL FROM BACK SOUND TO LOOKOUT BIGHT, NC	195,000	195,000
FALLS LAKE, NC	924,000	924,000
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	836,000	836,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	5,845,000	5,845,000
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	2,076,000	2,076,000
NEUSE RIVER, NC	133,000	133,000
NEW RIVER INLET, NC	1,064,000	1,064,000
NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	841,000	841,000
OCRACOKE INLET, NC	278,000	278,000
ROLLINSON CHANNEL, NC	405,000	405,000
SILVER LAKE HARBOR, NC	805,000	805,000
W. KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	1,505,000	1,505,000
WATERWAY CONNECTING PAMLICO SOUND AND BEAUFORT HARBOR,	281,000	281,000
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	4,934,000	4,934,000
NORTH DAKOTA		
BOWMAN HALEY LAKE, ND	307,000	307,000
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	7,397,000	7,397,000
HOMME LAKE AND DAM, ND	124,000	124,000
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	862,000	862,000
LAKE SAKAKAWEA	---	50,000
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	491,000	491,000
OHIO		
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	772,000	772,000
ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	414,000	414,000
BERLIN LAKE, OH	1,564,000	1,564,000
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	680,000	680,000
CLARENCE J. BROWN DAM, OH	487,000	487,000
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	6,702,000	6,702,000
CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	139,000	139,000
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	438,000	438,000
DELAWARE LAKE, OH	492,000	492,000
DILLON LAKE, OH	721,000	721,000
FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	511,000	511,000
HURON HARBOR, OH	605,000	605,000
LORAIN HARBOR, OH	872,000	872,000
MASSILLON, OH	25,000	25,000
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	686,000	686,000
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	860,000	860,000
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	5,806,000	5,806,000
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	459,000	459,000
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	504,000	504,000
ROSEVILLE, OH	25,000	25,000
SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	683,000	683,000
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	7,105,000	7,105,000
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	269,000	269,000
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	416,000	416,000
WILLIAM H. HARSHA LAKE, OH	583,000	583,000
OKLAHOMA		
ARCADIA LAKE, OK	422,000	422,000
BIRCH LAKE, OK	709,000	709,000
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	2,002,000	2,002,000
CANDY LAKE, OK	39,000	39,000
CANTON LAKE, OK	5,425,000	5,425,000
COPAN LAKE, OK	991,000	991,000
EUFAULA LAKE, OK	5,169,000	5,169,000
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	3,311,000	3,311,000
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	919,000	919,000
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	521,000	521,000
HEYBURN LAKE, OK	532,000	532,000
HUGO LAKE, OK	918,000	918,000
HULAH LAKE, OK	456,000	456,000
KAW LAKE, OK	1,347,000	1,347,000
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	2,797,000	2,797,000
OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	1,211,000	1,211,000
OPTIMA LAKE, OK	541,000	541,000
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR - LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	8,000	8,000
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	830,000	830,000
ROBERT S. KERR L&D AND RESERVOIRS, OK	3,041,000	3,041,000
SARDIS LAKE, OK	846,000	846,000
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	1,471,000	1,471,000
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	3,113,000	3,113,000
WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,194,000	1,194,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	3,025,000	3,025,000
WISTER LAKE, OK	796,000	796,000
OREGON		
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	471,000	471,000
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	178,000	178,000
BONNEVILLE LOCK & DAM-LAKE BONNEVILLE, OR	11,388,000	11,388,000
CHETCO RIVER, OR	432,000	432,000
COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLA	11,094,000	11,094,000
COLUMBIA RIVER AT MOUTH, OR & WA	8,849,000	8,849,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA & THE DALLES, OR.	461,000	461,000
COLUMBIA & SNAKE RIVERS PORTS DREDGING, OR & WA	---	8,000,000
COOS & MILLICOMA RIVERS, OR	190,000	190,000
COOS BAY, OR	4,313,000	4,313,000
COQUILLE RIVER, OR	302,000	302,000
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	621,000	621,000
COUGAR LAKE, OR	1,037,000	1,037,000
DETROIT LAKE, OR	1,917,000	1,917,000
DORENA LAKE, OR	613,000	613,000
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	369,000	369,000
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	733,000	733,000
GREEN PETER-FOSTER LAKES, OR	2,152,000	2,152,000
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	769,000	769,000
JOHN DAY LOCK & DAM - LAKE UMATILLA, OR	13,557,000	13,557,000
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	3,057,000	3,057,000
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	3,368,000	3,368,000
MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR	10,780,000	10,780,000
PORT ORFORD, OR	301,000	301,000
ROGUE RIVER AT GOLD BEACH, OR	713,000	713,000
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	656,000	656,000
SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	413,000	413,000
TILLAMOOK BAY & BAR, OR	274,000	274,000
UMPQUA RIVER, OR	1,147,000	1,147,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	704,000	704,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR	166,000	166,000
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	426,000	426,000
YAQUINA BAY & HARBOR, OR	1,221,000	1,221,000
PENNSYLVANIA		
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	9,209,000	9,209,000
ALVIN R. BUSH DAM, PA	411,000	411,000
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	178,000	178,000
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	753,000	753,000
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	1,456,000	1,456,000
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	1,003,000	1,003,000
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	1,315,000	1,315,000
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,592,000	1,592,000
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	421,000	421,000
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	861,000	861,000
ERIE HARBOR, PA	46,000	46,000
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	513,000	513,000
FRANCIS E. WALTER DAM, PA	703,000	703,000
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM & RESERVOIR, PA	233,000	233,000
JOHNSTOWN, PA	606,000	706,000
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,348,000	1,348,000
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	1,077,000	1,077,000
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	1,432,000	1,432,000
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	15,522,000	15,522,000
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS CONSTRUCTION, PA	9,129,000	9,129,000
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL, PA	155,000	155,000
PROMPTON LAKE, PA	562,000	562,000
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	5,000	5,000
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	2,998,000	2,998,000
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	97,000	97,000
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	1,772,000	1,772,000
STILLWATER LAKE, PA	292,000	292,000
TIOGA-HAMMOND LAKES, PA	1,715,000	1,765,000
TIONESTA LAKE, PA	977,000	977,000
UNION CITY LAKE, PA	265,000	265,000
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	715,000	715,000
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	446,000	446,000
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA	1,962,000	1,962,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
PUERTO RICO		
ARECIBO HARBOR, PR	375,000	375,000
MAYAQUEZ HARBOR, PR	150,000	150,000
PONCE HARBOR, PR	400,000	400,000
SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	600,000	600,000
SOUTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (CHARLESTON DISTRICT),	3,067,000	3,067,000
BROOKGREEN GARDEN CANAL, SC	70,000	70,000
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,611,000	3,611,000
CHARLESTON HARBOR, REDIVERSION, SC	---	4,825,000
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,405,000	3,405,000
FOLLY RIVER, SC	6,000	6,000
GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	3,014,000	3,014,000
JEREMY CREEK, SC	3,000	3,000
LITTLE RIVER INLET, SC & NC	80,000	80,000
MURRELLS INLET, SC	84,000	84,000
PORT ROYAL HARBOR, SC	1,344,000	1,344,000
SHIPYARD RIVER, SC	409,000	409,000
TOWN CREEK, SC	6,000	460,000
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG BEND DAM - LAKE SHARPE, SD	5,814,000	5,814,000
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	190,000	190,000
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	152,000	152,000
FT. RANDALL DAM - LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	6,862,000	6,862,000
LAKE TRAVERSE AND BOIS DE SIOUX, SD & MN	310,000	310,000
OAHE DAM - LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	8,487,000	8,487,000
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	6,934,000	6,934,000
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	6,372,000	6,372,000
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	3,653,000	3,653,000
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	3,712,000	3,712,000
J. PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	2,997,000	2,997,000
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	5,409,000	5,409,000
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	13,212,000	13,212,000
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	693,000	693,000
TEXAS		
AQUILLA LAKE, TX	586,000	586,000
ARKANSAS-RED RIVER CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VIII, TX	694,000	694,000
BARBOUR CUT TERMINAL CHANNEL, TX	49,000	49,000
BARDWELL LAKE, TX	1,474,000	1,474,000
BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX	97,000	97,000
BELTON LAKE, TX	3,439,000	3,439,000
BENBROOK LAKE, TX	1,224,000	1,224,000
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	49,000	49,000
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	1,714,000	1,714,000
CANYON LAKE, TX	1,521,000	1,521,000
CHANNEL TO HARLINGEN, TX	1,015,000	1,015,000
CHANNEL TO PORT MANSFIELD, TX	2,127,000	2,127,000
CHANNEL TO VICTORIA - GIWW, TX	176,000	176,000
COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS, TX	742,000	742,000
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,967,000	1,967,000
DENISON DAM - LAKE TEXOMA, TX	5,326,000	5,326,000
ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	5,000	5,000
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM - LAKE O'THE PINES, TX	1,976,000	1,976,000
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	2,097,000	2,097,000
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	212,000	212,000
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,712,000	1,712,000
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	1,707,000	1,707,000
GREENS BAYOU CHANNEL, TX	49,000	49,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	16,330,000	16,330,000
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	857,000	857,000
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	5,295,000	5,295,000
JOE POOL LAKE, TX	539,000	539,000
LAKE KEMP, TX	217,000	217,000
LAVON LAKE, TX	3,523,000	3,523,000
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	2,140,000	2,140,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	2,268,000	2,268,000
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	1,355,000	1,355,000
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	1,153,000	1,153,000
O. C. FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,558,000	2,558,000
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	859,000	859,000
PROCTOR LAKE, TX	1,415,000	1,415,000
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	628,000	628,000
SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TX	8,111,000	8,111,000
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	2,852,000	2,852,000
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	2,164,000	2,164,000
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	1,311,000	1,311,000
TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,895,000	1,895,000
TOWN BLUFF DAM-STEINHAGEN LAKE-WILLIS HYDROPOWER, TX	1,275,000	1,275,000
TRINITY RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, TX	1,541,000	1,541,000
WACO LAKE, TX	1,856,000	1,856,000
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	404,000	404,000
WHITNEY LAKE, TX	2,780,000	2,780,000
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,738,000	1,738,000
VERMONT		
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	570,000	570,000
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	408,000	408,000
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	475,000	475,000
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	582,000	582,000
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	350,000	350,000
VIRGINIA		
APPOMATTOX RIVER, VA	383,000	383,000
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, VA	3,801,000	3,801,000
BONUM CREEK, VA	123,000	123,000
BROAD CREEK, VA	---	50,000
CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS, VA	54,000	54,000
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	617,000	617,000
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	1,233,000	1,233,000
HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR (DRIFT REMOVAL	237,000	237,000
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	1,170,000	1,170,000
JOHN H. KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC	6,643,000	6,643,000
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,124,000	1,124,000
NEWPORT NEWS CREEK, VA	190,000	190,000
NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), V	309,000	309,000
NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, VA	4,530,000	4,530,000
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	349,000	349,000
PARKER CREEK, VA	---	50,000
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	1,719,000	1,719,000
POTOMAC RIVER AT ALEXANDRIA, VA	168,000	168,000
THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL, VA	186,000	186,000
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	1,463,000	1,463,000
WASHINGTON		
ANACORTES HARBOR, WA	29,000	29,000
BELLINGHAM HARBOR, WA	44,000	44,000
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	9,958,000	9,958,000
COLUMBIA R. SYSTEM OPERATION REVIEW, WA, OR, ID & MT	1,753,000	1,753,000
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR	201,000	201,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK & SAND ISLAND, WA	5,000	5,000
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	955,000	955,000
GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	5,034,000	5,034,000
HOWARD A HANSON DAM, WA	1,070,000	1,070,000
ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	8,713,000	8,713,000
KENMORE NAVIGATION CHANNEL, WA	16,000	16,000
LAKE CROCKETT (KEYSTONE HARBOR), WA	241,000	241,000
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	6,878,000	6,878,000
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	8,556,000	8,556,000
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	5,667,000	5,667,000
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	6,037,000	6,037,000
MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	577,000	577,000
MT. ST. HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL STRUCTURE , WA	724,000	724,000
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	1,628,000	1,628,000
OLYMPIA HARBOR, WA	29,000	29,000
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	741,000	741,000
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	566,000	566,000
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	395,000	395,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
SWINOMISH CHANNEL, WA	725,000	725,000
TACOMA - PUYALLUP, WA	46,000	46,000
TACOMA HARBOR, WA	33,000	33,000
THE DALLES LOCK & DAM - LAKE CELILO, WA	7,133,000	7,133,000
WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	61,000	61,000
WYNOOCHEE LAKE, WA	97,000	97,000
WEST VIRGINIA		
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	839,000	839,000
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	1,529,000	1,529,000
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,171,000	1,171,000
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	1,132,000	1,132,000
ELK RIVER HARBOR, WV	1,000	1,000
ELKINS, WV	5,000	5,000
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	8,534,000	8,534,000
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS HUNTINGTON, WV	14,333,000	14,333,000
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK HUNTINGTON, WV	1,764,000	1,764,000
R. D. BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,186,000	1,186,000
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	865,000	865,000
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,168,000	1,168,000
SUTTON LAKE, WV	1,602,000	1,602,000
TYGART LAKE, WV	1,139,000	1,139,000
WISCONSIN		
ASHLAND HARBOR, WI	195,000	195,000
CORNUCOPIA HARBOR, WI	72,000	72,000
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE WISCONSIN, WI	535,000	535,000
FOX RIVER, WI	1,679,000	1,679,000
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	1,783,000	1,783,000
KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	468,000	468,000
LA FARGE LAKE, WI	25,000	25,000
MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	691,000	691,000
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	1,258,000	1,258,000
PORT WASHINGTON HBR, WI	189,000	189,000
PORT WING HARBOR, WI	60,000	60,000
SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI	606,000	606,000
STURGEON BAY, WI	510,000	510,000
WYOMING		
JACKSON HOLE, SNAKE RIVER, WY	945,000	945,000
MISCELLANEOUS		
BEACH DISPOSAL (SECTION 933)	600,000	600,000
COASTAL AMERICA PARTNERSHIP	7,000,000	---
DREDGING RESEARCH PROGRAM	5,000,000	5,000,000
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW GUIDE FOR OPERATIONS	2,500,000	2,500,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	7,811,000	7,811,000
MONITORING OF COMPLETED COASTAL PROJECTS	2,000,000	2,000,000
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM (NEPP)	8,000,000	8,000,000
POLICY AND PROCEDURES OPTIONS FOR PROJECT O&M	1,500,000	1,500,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS	8,979,000	8,979,000
PROTECTION, CLEARING, AND STRAIGHTENING OF CHANNELS (S	50,000	50,000
RECREATION PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE	200,000	200,000
REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	1,000,000	1,000,000
REPAIR, EVALUATION, MAINTENANCE, AND REHABILITATION RE	6,000,000	6,000,000
SCHEDULING OF FLOOD CONTROL RESERVOIR OPERATIONS	2,853,000	2,853,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS	3,144,000	3,144,000
WATER CONTROL RESEARCH PROGRAM	675,000	---
WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	3,885,000	3,885,000
WETLANDS ACTION PLAN AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM	1,000,000	1,000,000
WETLANDS RESEARCH PROGRAM	11,000,000	7,000,000
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-42,682,000	-42,682,000
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,514,935,000	1,537,265,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:

(N)	NAVIGATION
(BE)	BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(FC)	FLOOD CONTROL
(MP)	MULTIPURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER

GENERAL REGULATORY FUNCTIONS

Appropriations, 1991	$71,100,000
Budget estimate, 1992	86,000,000
House allowance	86,000,000
Committee recommendation	86,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $86,000,000 for fiscal year 1992 for general regulatory functions. This is the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers general regulatory functions were formerly financed as part of the "Operation and maintenance, general appropriation" account. The appropriation recommended provides salaries, expenses, and related costs to administer laws pertaining to regulation of navigable waters and wetlands of the United States in accordance with the River and Harbors Act of 1899, the Clean Water Act of 1977, and the Marine Protection Act of 1972.

The Committee has approved, with some reservation, the full budget request for regulatory activities of the Corps of Engineers, which is $14,900,000 over the current year's appropriation.

The Committee has continued to receive many complaints about the administration and enforcement of the Clean Water Act's section 404 permit program, and in particular about the increase in lands identified and delineated as wetlands and thus subject to the 404 permit program as a result of the implementation of the Federal Manual for Identifying and Delineating Jurisdictional Wetlands in March 1989. This manual was developed by the four Federal agencies involved with wetlands identification and delineation alone, and is the basis for these agencies' determination of what constitutes an area subject to regulation under section 404. The use of the 1989 manual's criteria for these identifications and delineations was made compulsory unlike the 1987 manual which was advisory only, allowing room for flexibility in individual circumstances. Despite the importance and mandatory use of this manual, it was not subjected to the rulemaking process of the Administrative Procedure Act, which would have given landowners and the public notice and opportunity to be heard on the changes made. Nor was it submitted to the Congress for consideration or debate.

The Committee believes this was a serious mistake. What originally was interpreted as a program to regulate discharges into publicly owned navigable water of the United States has—through a series of administrative and judicial decisions—been expanded into a program which regulates lands in private ownership which are adjacent to navigable and other bodies of water over which the Corps has jurisdiction, even when these lands are not periodically inundated or flooded. Today about 75 percent of the lands now regulated under 404 are in private ownership, for the sake of fundamental fairness at the minimum these landowners were entitled to notice of the proposed changes in determining wetlands boundaries and an opportunity to be heard before the changes were put in place.

Had such notice and opportunity been given to these landowners, clarifications and changes could have been made which would have reduced the opportunity for erroneous wetlands jurisdictional determinations which have caused so many complaints. In addition, such notice and opportunity for comment would have helped educate landowners about the need for a determination and a permit prior to the initiation of restricted activities on lands now delineated as wetlands avoiding innocent, unknowing violations of the program for which some have been severely penalized.

Moreover, the Committee believes that the wetlands enforcement initiative jointly developed by the Corps and the Environmental Protection Agency which was announced by the Directorate of Civil Works in a regulatory guidance letter issued on December 17, 1990, is at best misguided. This initiative which purports to be an effort to educate the public about the requirements of the section 404 permit program and the importance of wetlands in fact proposes a punitive system of enforcement quotas to scare the public into compliance. As outlined in a memorandum accompanying this letter, each Corps district is required to submit at least two planned or pending enforcement actions to Corps headquarters for the proposed spring and autumn joint Corps-EPA press conferences which are to be held to publicize violations. Each EPA region is also required to submit one or more civil judicial referrals (and issue administrative compliance orders or administrative penalty orders) to EPA headquarters for each joint press conference. In the end, this scare campaign strategy will not further voluntary compliance or help educate the public about the importance of wetlands. Instead, this strategy will only increase the outrage many landowners now have about Federal regulation of private property as a few are singled out, some of whom may have innocently and unknowingly failed to obtain a permit, for harsh penalties.

Because the Committee believes that landowners, at the minimum, were entitled to notice and opportunity to be heard before these mandatory changes were implemented, the Committee has included language prohibiting the Corps from using any funds made available in this act to delineate any land as a "water of the United States" under the 1989 delineation manual or any subsequent manual not adopted in accordance with the rulemaking process of the Administrative Procedures Act. That is, until the 1989 delineation manual or any subsequent manual is subjected to the Administrative Procedures Act, the Corps is restricted to the pre-1989 criteria it used in identifying and delineating lands as wetlands. These criteria were set forth in the 1987 manual which was used in various regions throughout the country for almost a decade.

Moreover, no funds may be used by the Corps for the application or enforcements of the provisions of section 404 of the Clean Water Act to activities undertaken on lands identified and delineated as a "water of the United States" under the flawed manual or any subsequent manual which is adopted pursuant to the same flawed process—without being subject to the rulemaking process of the Administrative Procedure Act. This further restriction follows the long held prohibition on the use of "fruits of the forbidden tree." Enforcement actions and the application of the provisions of section 404 to activities undertaken on lands identified and delineated as a wetland under the pre–1989 criteria will not be affected.

The Committee does recognize the need for a public outreach program to make the public aware of the requirements of the section 404 program and to educate the public about the importance of wetlands and the multiple uses of this resource. Therefore, we specifically direct the Corps to submit a plan for such a positive outreach program within 60 days of enactment of this bill. In this respect, we direct the Corps' attention to the positive outreach program proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 6, which urges the President to declare 1992 as the Year of the Wetlands and to undertake positive outreach activities to promote a better understanding and awareness of our Nation's wetlands resources and the appropriate means by which all Americans can be better stewards of this resource.

The Committee notes that the Corps has significantly increased its wetlands research program, and has developed in particular the wetlands evaluation technique [WET] to try to help assess the functions and values of wetlands, an area which the Corps correctly identifies as one of the greatest challenges facing regulatory agencies. The Committee also notes that the Corps has undertaken expanded responsibilities for the preservation and restoration of wetlands, and will be involved in implementing the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act (Public Law 101-646). To assist the Corps in its mission to build and protect wetlands, the Corps is directed to establish an independent research program to study wetlands loss mitigation. This effort should concentrate on the engineering aspects of wetlands preservation and on the effects and effectiveness of attempts to halt or slow the process of wetlands loss. The research center should work closely with personnel responsible for implementing Public Law 101-646. In addition, because one of the most serious long-term threats to coastal wetlands is posed by the rise of sea level caused by global warming, this activity should take maximum advantage of the ongoing research into the effects of global environmental change.

The Committee has also received a number of complaints about the amount of time required to complete permit evaluations. Although the Corps claims that 92 percent of all permit evaluations are completed in less than 60 days, the Committee notes that these figures do not take into account the time applicants spend in submitting additional material to the Corps before the application is accepted and the clock starts running. In addition, the Committee notes with concern that, by the Corps' own account, only 50 percent of the individual permit applications are completed within the 60 day timeframe. Of the remaining individual permit applications, 25 percent require 120 days to be completed and the remaining 25 percent take over 1 year to complete. These delays are causing substantial burdens on individual permit applicants. In one instance about which the Committee received testimony earlier this spring, the cost of a local drainage project was increased by $500,000 because of the long delay encountered in seeking a permit. In other cases, financing packages have been lost and planting opportunities foregone by these delays, causing substantial hardship to individual applicants. Therefore, the Committee urges the Corps to concentrate the additional resources and personnel it will receive in the individual permit area to reduce the amount of time required for completion of these permit applications.

The Committee has also received an outpouring of complaints about fee increases proposed by the Corps for permits last fall (see Federal Register, vol. 55, No. 197, Thursday, Oct. 11, 1990). Under this proposal, permit application fees for commercial permits would be increased from $100 to $2,000, and for noncommercial individual applications from $10 to $500. In addition, substantial increases are proposed for wetlands jurisdictional delineations ranging from $150 for a partial fee (a delineation not requiring an onsite visit) for tracts less than 10 acres to $750 (plus actual costs) for tracts greater than 500 acres. For full fee delineations (those requiring onsite visits), the fee would range from $300 for a tract involving 10 acres or less to $1,500 (plus actual costs) for tracts greater than 500 acres. In addition, under this proposal no permit application will be accepted unless accompanied by a $100 minimum fee, including those applications requesting a waiver or partial waiver of the fee, and no wetlands delineation will be begun until the full fee required is in hand.

The Committee believes the fee schedule as proposed would impose a substantial hardship on many individuals and therefore has included a provision prohibiting the Corps from using any funds provided in this act to finalize or implement this proposal. Further, the Committee directs the Corps to consult closely with the Appropriations Committees and the appropriate authorizing committees before developing any other new fee schedule to assure that any such proposal avoids the substantial hardship problems associated with the October 1990 proposal.

REVOLVING FUND

The Committee understands that the Corps is nearing completion of a restudy of its minimum dredge fleet requirements for national defense and national emergency under Public Law 95-269. Until the Corps has completed the restudy and a formal recommendation is presented, the Committee directs that no new dredge construction be initiated, except the dredge *Hurley*. In determining the size and composition of the minimum dredge fleet, the Corps of Engineers should consult with private industry to encourage maximum private investment in new dredging capability. The Committee urges that the Corps reexamine its current operational schedule for hopper dredges to determine if the schedule is reasonably necessary to keep its hopper dredge fleet fully operational.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriations, 1991	$20,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	15,000,000
House allowance	15,000,000
Committee recommendation	15,000,000

An appropriation of $15,000,000 is recommended for flood control and coastal emergencies.

This activity provides for flood emergency preparation, flood fighting and rescue operations, and repair of flood control and Federal hurricane and shore protection works. It also provides for emergency supplies of clean drinking water where the source has been contaminated and, in drought distressed areas, provision of adequate supplies of water for human and livestock consumption. In the event of a major flood or coastal emergency, additional funds will be requested.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1991	$126,600,000
Budget estimate, 1992	150,000,000
House allowance	142,000,000
Committee recommendation	142,000,000

An amount of $142,000,000 is recommended for general expenses of the Corps of Engineers, which is the same as the House allowance.

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office, Chief of Engineers, the Division offices, the Board for Rivers and Harbors, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers.

General Provisions

CORPS OF ENGINEERS REORGANIZATION

The Committee adopted an amendment providing bill language under title I, general provisions, which is self-explanatory, as follows:

Section 105. None of the funds in this act may be used to recommend closure or realignment of any U.S. Army Corps of Engineers civil works office, or by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to terminate, merge, or substantially reduce the work force of any such office prior to the enactment by Congress of legislation authorizing such a policy.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1991	$13,221,000
Budget estimate, 1992	12,614,000
House allowance	13,789,000
Committee recommendation	13,204,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $13,204,000.

Fort Hall Indian water rights settlement.—The Committee recommendation includes $200,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to conduct environmental compliance activities related to the Fort Hall Indian water rights agreement.

Tongue River Dam, MT.—The Committee recommendation includes $40,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to complete an environmental analysis and special report to support the decisionmaking process of spillway alternatives and reserved water right issues related to the Tongue River Dam in Montana. The Committee understands that legislation to authorize the construction of this project has not yet been passed and signed into law.

Ute water development project, NM.—Within available funds, the Bureau of Reclamation is directed to use $100,000 to undertake an environmental assessment of the Ute water development project in New Mexico. The Committee understands that there has been significant local work on this project and that this work is needed to analyze the feasibility of providing water to eight communities and Cannon Air Force Base.

Tualatin River Basin, OR.—The Committee has included $200,000 for a study of alternatives to meet the increased water resource needs of the Tualatin River basin by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Southeastern South Dakota pipeline.—The committee has provided $100,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to assist the State of South Dakota in the development of a needs assessment, and relevant planning studies related to the southeastern South Dakota water supply pipeline project.

The recommended amounts provided under this heading for surveys and activities are shown in the following table:

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $667,897,000
Budget estimate, 1992	546,279,000
House allowance	553,209,000
Committee recommendation	564,409,000

[1] Includes $25,000,000 appropriated in Fiscal Year 1991 Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act.

A new appropriation of $564,409,000 is recommended by the Committee.

The amounts recommended by the Committee are shown on the following table along with the budget request and House allowance.

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS					
ARIZONA					
UPPER SAN PEDRO RIVER OPTIMIZATION STUDY..............	450,000	75,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
CALIFORNIA					
AMERICAN RIVER FOLSOM SOUTH OPTIMIZATION STUDY........	250,000	50,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
DELTA WATER MANAGEMENT................................	---	---	---	425,000	100,000
INDIAN WELLS VALLEY WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY............	524,432	402,432	122,000	122,000	122,000
KESWICK RESERVOIR WATER QUALITY STUDY.................	20,000	---	20,000	20,000	20,000
OFFSTREAM STORAGE INVESTIGATION.......................	---	---	---	200,000	100,000
REFUGE WATER SUPPLIES.................................	819,171	719,171	100,000	100,000	100,000
SAN JOAQUIN BASIN ACTION PLAN.........................	90,000	---	40,000	40,000	40,000
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN RESOURCE MGMT. INITIATIVE.....	2,540,000	200,000	310,000	310,000	310,000
SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY CONVEYANCE.........................	---	---	---	200,000	100,000
SANTA ANA WATERSHED MANAGEMENT STUDY..................	747,492	497,492	250,000	250,000	250,000
COLORADO					
DOLORES RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT STUDY.........	250,000	---	125,000	125,000	125,000
UPPER ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN WATER QUALITY INVESTIGATION	600,000	---	275,000	275,000	275,000
UPPER GUNNISON-UNCOMPAHGRE BASIN PROJECT..............	920,000	365,787	160,000	160,000	160,000
IDAHO					
IDAHO RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT........................	525,000	---	150,000	150,000	150,000
MINIDOKA, NORTHSIDE PUMP. DIV DRAINWTR MGMT STUDY.....	350,000	80,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
KANSAS					
ARKANSAS RIVER WATER MGMT. IMPROVEMENT STUDY..........	789,401	656,401	133,000	133,000	133,000
MONTANA					
FLATHEAD RIVER BASIN STORAGE OPTIMIZATION STUDY.......	495,000	253,608	185,000	185,000	185,000
TONGUE RIVER DAM......................................	---	---	---	---	40,000
NEBRASKA					
LOUP RIVER BASIN WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY...............	175,000	75,000	---	---	100,000
NEVADA					
NORTHERN NEVADA WATER AUGMENTATION PROGRAM............	500,000	442,000	58,000	58,000	58,000

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
NEW MEXICO					
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE ASSISSMENT/MGMT STUDY................	500,000	---	100,000	100,000	100,000
NEW MEXICO REGIONAL WATER RESOURCES STUDY.............	600,000	200,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
OREGON					
GRANDE RONDE WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY.................	500,000	220,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
JOSEPHINE COUNTY WATER MGMT IMPROVEMENT STUDY.........	711,000	545,797	100,000	100,000	100,000
TUALATIN RIVER BASIN..................................	500,000	---	---	---	200,000
UPPER DESCHUTES RIV BASIN WATER CONSERVATION PROJECT..	949,000	462,484	220,000	220,000	220,000
UPPER JOHN DAY WATER OPTIMIZATION PROJECT.............	765,624	712,624	53,000	53,000	53,000
WILLAMETTE RIV BASIN WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY.........	758,000	498,264	135,000	135,000	135,000
SOUTH DAKOTA					
BLACK HILLS HYDROLOGY STUDY...........................	---	---	---	350,000	100,000
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER SUPPLY.........................	---	---	---	50,000	---
SOUTHEASTERN PIPELINE.................................	200,000	100,000	---	---	100,000
TEXAS					
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN TOTAL WATER MGMT STUDY.....	650,000	356,622	50,000	50,000	50,000
LOWER RIO GRANDE BASIN STUDY..........................	600,000	---	50,000	50,000	50,000
UTAH					
SEVIER RIVER WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY...................	465,358	339,358	126,000	126,000	126,000
UTAH AREA WATER DEMAND MODEL..........................	286,824	160,824	126,000	126,000	126,000
WASHINGTON					
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT..........	8,029,737	7,429,737	600,000	600,000	600,000
WYOMING					
WIND RIVER BASIN STUDY................................	425,0[illegible]	46,000	125,000	125,000	125,000

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
VARIOUS					
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM......	58,222,815	51,887,040	1,013,000	1,013,000	1,013,000
DROUGHT INVESTIGATIONS..................................	1,200,000	220,000	180,000	180,000	180,000
ENVIRONMENTAL & INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES...	5,988,955	3,060,955	2,928,000	2,928,000	2,728,000
FISH & WILDLIFE HABITAT PRESERVATION & ENHANCEMENT....	1,550,000	---	150,000	150,000	150,000
FOUR CORNERS WATER ASSESSMENT.........................	425,000	186,064	150,000	150,000	150,000
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES..............................	1,786,951	886,951	900,000	900,000	900,000
INVESTIGATION OF EXISTING PROJECTS....................	969,021	561,021	408,000	408,000	408,000
MINOR WORK ON COMPLETED INVESTIGATIONS................	1,213,564	673,564	540,000	540,000	540,000
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES........................	3,028,290	1,611,290	1,417,000	1,417,000	1,417,000
TOXIC CONSTITUENT STUDIES.............................	1,264,000	358,890	100,000	100,000	100,000
UPPER SNAKE RIVER BASIN STORAGE OPTIMIZATION..........	759,000	528,564	100,000	100,000	100,000
WALLA WALLA RIVER STREAMFLOW IMPROVEMENT PROJECT......	660,000	---	130,000	130,000	130,000
WETLANDS PRESERVATION/RESTORATION.....................	310,000	---	210,000	160,000	160,000
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.........................			12,614,000	13,789,000	13,204,000

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM					
CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS					
ARIZONA					
HEADGATE ROCK HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT	52,800,000	47,360,670	4,589,000	4,589,000	4,589,000
INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT PROJECT (SAWRSA)	36,786,000	5,375,167	6,708,000	6,708,000	6,708,000
CALIFORNIA					
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:					
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT	2,232,680,000	348,004,233	1,500,000	2,400,000	2,000,000
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	710,762,000	640,519,498	6,680,000	7,880,000	7,180,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	398,294,000	320,364,404	16,786,000	16,786,000	16,786,000
SAN FELIPE DIVISION	352,464,000	304,612,948	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
SAN LUIS UNIT	1,375,527,000	565,804,830	4,235,000	4,235,000	4,235,000
TRINITY RIVER RESTORATION PROGRAM	297,964,000	280,974,874	6,870,000	6,870,000	6,870,000
COLORADO					
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP	265,259,000	89,797,689	16,371,000	16,371,000	16,371,000
LOWER GUNNISON BASIN UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP	193,751,000	7,465,926	6,998,000	6,998,000	6,998,000
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP	87,832,000	58,974,611	4,410,000	4,410,000	4,410,000
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN DIVISION	96,222,000	89,748,125	5,969,000	5,969,000	5,969,000
MONTANA					
TONGUE RIVER DAM	---	---	---	2,000,000	---
NEBRASKA					
NORTH LOUP DIVISON, P-SMBP	348,610,000	289,676,078	21,350,000	21,350,000	21,350,000
NORTH DAKOTA					
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P-SMBP	1,509,540,000	423,203,640	25,000,000	25,000,000	35,000,000
OREGON					
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT	---	---	---	4,000,000	4,000,000
SOUTH DAKOTA					
BELLE FOURCHE UNIT, P-SMBP	49,256,000	26,110,198	7,885,000	7,885,000	7,885,000
MNI WICONI PROJECT	---	---	---	2,150,000	2,450,000

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
WASHINGTON					
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT:					
IRRIGATION FACILITIES	4,533,788,704	1,678,907,406	4,060,000	4,060,000	4,060,000
THIRD POWER PLANT, GRAND COULEE DAM	749,514,704	748,514,704	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
WYOMING					
BUFFALO BILL DAM MODIFICATION, P-SMBP	81,800,000	76,041,000	5,440,000	5,440,000	5,440,000
VARIOUS					
BOULDER CANYON PROJECT, AZ,NV	69,000,000	34,495,466	23,440,000	23,440,000	23,440,000
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJ., TITLE I	458,298,000	377,098,936	20,174,000	20,174,000	20,174,000
SUBTOTAL, REGULAR CONSTRUCTION			190,465,000	200,715,000	207,915,000
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:					
BOISE PROJECT, PAYETTE DIVISION, ID	37,395,000	31,856,627	2,415,000	2,415,000	2,415,000
BRANTLEY PROJECT, NM	144,138,345	142,945,345	276,000	276,000	276,000
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK & LEVEE SYSTEM, AR,CO	121,853,000	70,562,579	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
CULTURAL RESOURCES ACT., ID,ND,MT,OR,SD,WA,WY	1,911,434	1,362,728	105,000	105,000	105,000
FRYINGAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT, CO	509,018,157	506,393,157	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
GILA PROJECT, AZ	78,115,000	77,484,136	38,000	38,000	38,000
KLAMATH PROJECT, OR,CA	54,567,000	46,006,702	1,448,000	1,448,000	1,448,000
LEADVILLE MINE DRAINAGE TUNNEL, CO	17,595,000	11,517,776	2,036,000	2,036,000	2,036,000
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT, OK	120,280,134	120,190,134	90,000	90,000	90,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT, ID	4,351,986	1,861,986	2,490,000	2,490,000	2,490,000
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT, OK	43,198,755	42,748,755	450,000	450,000	450,000
NEWLANDS PROJECT, NV	55,625,000	8,726,221	2,070,000	2,070,000	2,070,000
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM:					
EAST BENCH UNIT, MT	24,230,000	28,489,552	50,000	50,000	50,000
BOSTWICK DIVISION, NE	---	---	---	680,000	680,000
FARWELL UNIT, NE	44,486,000	42,703,666	760,000	760,000	760,000
OAHE UNIT, SD	490,000,000	42,381,119	85,000	85,000	85,000
OWL CREEK UNIT, WY	7,004,572	6,784,156	15,000	15,000	15,000
RAPID VALLEY PROJECT, SD	100,000	---	100,000	100,000	100,000
RECREATION FACILITIES AT EXISTING RESV, VARIOUS	1,019,000	275,000	696,000	696,000	696,000
SAN ANGELO PROJECT, TX	530,000	---	530,000	530,000	530,000
VELARDE COMMUNITY DITCH, NM	25,544,000	10,267,000	---	---	1,000,000
WASHOE PROJECT, CA,NV	377,237,000	43,467,470	305,000	305,000	305,000
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT, VARIOUS	13,852,000	1,900,000	3,029,000	3,029,000	3,029,000
YAKIMA FISH PASSAGE/PROTECTIVE FACILITIES, WA	48,347,000	42,371,790	3,550,000	3,550,000	3,550,000
SUBTOTAL, DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION			29,238,000	29,918,000	30,918,000
SAFETY OF DAMS PROGRAMS:					
BIA - DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	149,850,000	---	12,000,000	---	---
BOISE PROJECT, DEER FLAT DAM, ID	26,270,000	18,795,457	6,975,000	6,975,000	6,975,000
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJ., FOLSOM DAM, CA	21,000,000	5,049,465	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJ., SAN LUIS UNIT, O'NEILL DAM, CA	6,448,000	2,023,336	2,477,000	2,477,000	2,477,000
DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR DAM SAFETY PROGRAM...........	8,128,658	5,378,658	650,000	650,000	650,000
HYRUM PROJECT, UT....................................	2,315,545	1,015,545	100,000	100,000	100,000
INITIATE SOD CORRECTION ACTION, VARIOUS.............	225,301,179	19,797,179	11,825,000	11,825,000	11,825,000
MODIFICATION REPORTS & PRECONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY.....	43,176,945	33,676,945	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, BARTLETT DAM, AZ................	76,000,000	3,051,386	3,622,000	3,622,000	3,622,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, HORSESHOE DAM, AZ...............	39,232,000	2,150,073	4,701,000	4,701,000	4,701,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, STEWART MTN. DAM, AZ............	39,332,000	32,908,718	4,164,000	4,164,000	4,164,000
SAN CARLOS IRRIGATION, COOLIDGE DAM, AZ.............	52,299,000	10,101,755	23,234,000	23,234,000	23,234,000
SUBTOTAL, SAFETY OF DAMS...........................			82,748,000	70,748,000	70,748,000
REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT:					
HYRUM PROJECT, UT....................................	2,099,508	1,670,508	429,000	429,000	429,000
MILK RIVER, GLASGOW DIVISION, MT....................	2,060,000	499,000	410,000	410,000	410,000
MILK RIVER, MALTA DIVISION, MT......................	5,600,000	560,000	350,000	350,000	350,000
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT, UT..............................	11,869,000	3,794,010	2,648,000	2,648,000	2,648,000
WEBER BASIN PROJECT, UT..............................	19,639,000	2,348,530	9,195,000	9,195,000	9,195,000
SUBTOTAL, REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT...........			13,032,000	13,032,000	13,032,000
PRECONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY:					
COLORADO RIVER BRIDGE CROSSING, AZ,NV...............	89,000,000	1,676,936	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY:					
DESALTING TECHNOLOGY.................................	9,000,000	---	1,000,000	2,000,000	1,000,000
GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE................................	17,280,000	2,280,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
GROUNDWATER RECHARGE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM..........	20,000,000	14,215,000	3,992,000	3,992,000	3,992,000
WATER TECHNOLOGY/ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH.............	188,559,439	94,994,310	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
SUBTOTAL, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY................			14,992,000	15,992,000	14,992,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS...........			331,475,000	331,405,000	338,605,000

Tongue River Dam, MT.—Within available funds, $2,000,000 is provided, subject to authorization, to undertake design work and prepare an EIS for the Tongue River Dam project in Montana.

Sargent Irrigation District, NE.—The Committee has been informed of an erosion problem at Milburn Dam which is attached to the Sargent Feeder Canal. The Bureau of Reclamation is to use $200,000 provided for the current fiscal year to address the erosion problem or for lateral work. Within the recommendation for this account, the Bureau is to use up to $450,000 to continue the Sargent Irrigation District rehabilitation and betterment project. Up to $200,000 of this amount may be used for repair of the diversion dam without affecting the repayment contract if appropriate.

Newland project, NV.—The Committee notes that the Bureau has included in its construction budget funds to carry out activities with the Truckee-Carson-Pyramid Lake Water Rights Settlement Act which was passed last year. Since the act could have a major impact on the future operations of the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District, the Bureau is directed to enter into a cooperative agreement with the district for participation in the studies required by the act.

Velarde community ditch project, NM.—Within available funds, the Bureau shall make $1,000,000 available to rehabilitate irrigation ditches associated with the Velarde community ditch project in New Mexico.

Costilla Dam modification, NM.—The Committee has been informed of problems related to work performed by the Bureau of Reclamation on the Costilla Dam under the New Mexico dam safety program. The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to provide a report to the Committee regarding the circumstances and facts related to the dispute, and the responsibilities of the Bureau, and the remedies parties have in resolving the dispute. The report should be provided to the Committee on Appropriations not later than October 1, 1991.

Garrison Diversion Unit, ND.—The Committee recommendation includes $35,000,000 to continue construction of the Garrison Diversion Unit of the Missouri River basin plan in North Dakota.

The Committee plans to continue moving the authorized Garrison project forward and encourages the administration to reconsider its current position with regard to future funding requests.

Arbuckle project, OK.—In fiscal year 1991, Congress provided $500,000 to begin planning and design of a pipeline delivery system from the Arbuckle Reservoir to the city of Sulphur, OK. Prior to continued funding of this project, the Bureau of Reclamation should report to the Committee on the role this project would play in preserving and revitalizing the fresh and mineral springs within the Chickasaw National Recreation Area, the need for congressional authorization of a surface water treatment facility at the terminus of the Arbuckle Reservoir to Sulphur pipeline, and the appropriate reimbursement for the construction of the pipeline and treatment plant considering the national benefit to the National
the Chickasaw National Recreation Area and the ability of the cit
of Sulphur to fund such reimbursement.

Umatilla Basin project, OR.—It has been brought to the Committee's attention that a controversy exists about the Umatilla project with respect to irrigation of lands outside the formal boundaries of the project irrigation districts. Such irrigation outside formal boundaries has occurred for some years and was recognized in section 208 of Public Law 100-557, dated October 28, 1988. To provide a data base to assist parties in resolving the controversy, the Bureau of Reclamation's Pacific Northwest Region is now making a comprehensive review of all lands irrigated with Umatilla project water. Information developed from that review will be made available to the Committee, and will be useful in ensuring that the benefits of Federal investment in this project are committed to the purposes defined in the 1988 act, including Umatilla fishery restoration.

Central Utah project.—The Committee recommendation includes $66,091,000 to continue the central Utah project.

The Committee is aware that authorizing legislation related to the project passed both Houses of Congress during the 101st session only to die during the last hours of the session, not because of any problems with the project itself, but because of circumstances relating to other water resource issues.

The Committee also understands that the completion legislation requires that the district contribute 35 percent of the total cost for the design, engineering, and construction of the irrigation features of the project. The Committee is aware that the district, in anticipation of the passage of the legislation, is now expending funds in order to be able to meet the timeframe and deadlines which will be required. The Committee has included language in the bill which authorizes the credit of these expenditures toward the district cost-sharing obligations.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1991	$221,516,000
Budget estimate, 1992	258,685,000
House allowance	258,685,000
Committee recommendation	258,685,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $258,685,000, the same as the House allowance and budget request.

The appropriation recommended under this heading provides for the operation and maintenance of 37 projects, project areas, or divisions of projects in fiscal year 1992. Projects are operated for power production, municipal and industrial water supply, irrigation, flood control, and other benefits.

Provision is also made for administration of water marketing contracts on Corps of Engineers projects, examination of existing structures, and administration of the provisions of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (96 Stat. 1261).

Within available funds, $300,000 is provided to replace reservoir level gauges along the North Platte River.

Columbia and Snake Rivers, endangered salmon activities, OR and WA.—Within available funds, the Committee recommendation includes up to [illegible] $400,000, for water conservation projects, water [illegible] of [illegible] n, irrigation screening, and NEPA and ESA compliance in order to carry out the Bureau's share of the provisions of the Pacific Northwest salmon summit agreement.

Soap Lake, WA.—The Committee has previously appropriated funds to assist in protecting the mineral content of Soap Lake located in the State of Washington. The Bureau is directed to review those measures that have been taken, and to report to the Committee on Appropriations as soon as practicable concerning their adequacy and whether additional measures need to be undertaken.

LOAN PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1991	$5,708,000
Budget estimate, 1992	890,000
House allowance	890,000
Committee recommendation	2,890,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,890,000.

This appropriation provides for loans to non-Federal organizations for construction and rehabilitation of distribution systems and for loans and grants to construct small irrigation projects.

The Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 was enacted for the purpose of encouraging local participation by qualified organizations in the development of small reclamation projects and to provide Federal assistance in the development of similar projects by non-Federal organizations.

The Committee has included $1,000,000 each for the Tohono O'Odham Nation, Schuk Toak District, Arizona and the Eastern Municipal Water District No. 3, California loans for fiscal year 1992. The Committee understands that these loans have been processed to the Congress as required by law and are ready for initiation.

Funds provided under this heading are distributed as shown in the following table:

LOAN PROGRAM

Project title	Total Federal cost	Fiscal year 1992 budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
ARIZONA				
Tohono O'Odham Nation, Schuk Toak District				$1,000,000
CALIFORNIA				
Eastern Municipal Water District, No. 3				1,000,000
VARIOUS				
Administration of the loan program		$890,000	$890,000	890,000
Total, loan program		890,000	890,000	2,890,000

LOAN PROGRAM

(LIMITATION ON DIRECT LOANS)

Appropriations, 1991	($4,946,000)
Budget estimate, 1992	
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	(3,240,000)

The Committee recommends a loan limitation of $3,240,000. This limitation provides control over the gross obligations for the principal amount of loans that may be made under the loan program in fiscal year 1992.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1991	$51,431,000
Budget estimate, 1992	57,266,000
House allowance	53,745,000
Committee recommendation	53,745,000

An appropriation of $53,745,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is the same as the House allowance.

This appropriation finances the general administrative and technical direction of the reclamation program as performed by the Commissioner's office, Denver office, and other offices in the five regions of the Bureau of Reclamation.

EMERGENCY FUND

Appropriations, 1991	$1,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	1,000,000
House allowance	1,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,000,000 which is the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

This fund is used to assure continuous operation of all projects and project facilities governed by Federal reclamation law in the event of drought, canal bank failure, electrical system failures, municipal and industrial water delivery system failures, or other emergencies.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

Appropriations, 1991	$4,831,000
Budget estimate, 1992	5,900,000
House allowance	5,900,000
Committee recommendation	5,900,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $5,900,000 for the working capital fund of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The fund provides for more efficient financing and financial management of centralized administrative services and acquisition of the business acquisition project and other capital equipment for support of Bureau programs and for work performed for others.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Committee is aware that the Bureau of Reclamation has become increasingly involved in cost sharing arrangements, and continues to be involved in repayment contracts, with water user districts and associations, and commissions for the development of water projects. Since these projects are partially constructed with appropriated funds, the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92-463, provides specific procedures for the formation, meeting, and reporting of advisory committees when such committees are convened by the Federal Government.

The Committee has been informed that the provisions of Public Law 92-463 unduly restrict the ability of non-Federal interests to be actively involved in the planning, design, and construction of Bureau of Reclamation projects. Because non-Federal interests are sharing in the cost of constructing these projects, the Committee believes there should be increased involvement of non-Federal interests in project activities.

Therefore, the Committee has included a provision in the bill which allows the Bureau of Reclamation to increase participation by non-Federal project partners.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Funds recommended in the bill provide for Department of Energy programs relating to energy supply, research, and development activities including biological and environmental research, and basic energy sciences and supporting research and technical analysis; uranium supply and enrichment activities; general science and research activities; civilian nuclear waste fund; environmental restoration and waste management, both defense and nondefense; atomic energy defense activities; departmental administration; power marketing activities; the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; and the geothermal resources development fund.

DOE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL CAPABILITY

The Department of Energy maintains our Nation's great scientific capability through the national laboratories and other DOE-related institutions. These are an invaluable resource of mathematical, scientific, and engineering expertise that should be tapped to promote competitiveness through joint scientific and technological ventures with industry and academia and to improve the education of America's youth. The Committee once again urges the Department, and specifically the national laboratories, to actively seek areas of cooperation with the National Science Foundation, the Department of Education, and other departments, agencies, and universities to coordinate and maximize the use of the Nation's research dollars, facilities, and manpower in such joint ventures.

LABORATORY-DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Congress has recognized the importance of laboratory-directed research and development in Public Law 95-391, which gives DOE specific authority to approve the use of a reasonable amount of laboratory funds to conduct R&D projects selected at the discretion of the laboratory directors. However, last year the Congress expressed concern with the management of the Department's Laboratory-Directed Research and Development [LDRD] Program. To satisfy this concern, the Department issued DOE Order 5000.4 which strengthens the oversight and management of LDRD programs. The Department's response is important, because in these times of severe budget constraints laboratory-directed R&D is one of the few mechanisms available for the national laboratories to respond rapidly to national needs, and this mechanism must be protected. The Committee is aware of the new oversight procedures put in place by DOE Order 5000.4 and generally agrees with the percentage level for LDRD as provided for in the DOE order. The Committee has received the Department's "Report on Selected

Overhead Activities" which projects LDRD funding for fiscal year 1992. The Committee notes that this amount does not include contributions to LDRD funds generated from non-DOE sources, that is, "Work For Others," as required by the DOE Order 5000.4, thus leading to uncertainties about the total projected fiscal year 1992 LDRD funding level. Therefore, the Committee concludes that the percentage ceiling level for LDRD funding specified in DOE Order 5000.4 is the most appropriate way to determine the level of LDRD funding. Restricting the LDRD program to a dollar value based on estimated funding for fiscal year 1992 will adversely impact the ability of the Department to address changing needs. The Committee approves and supports a full LDRD program as provided for in DOE Order 5000.4.

TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

In addition, the Department and the laboratories should take such steps as are necessary to improve the transfer of technology and the results of research and development to the marketplace. The DOE management is also urged to review the current framework, processes, and programs used for R&D laboratory technology transfer.

STANDARDS FOR STORAGE AND DISPOSAL OF HAZARDOUS WASTE

The Committee is concerned that there currently exist no consistent Federal minimum standards for storage and disposal of hazardous wastes that may contain trace amounts of radioactive materials. The Committee directs the Department to work with the Environmental Protection Agency and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to develop minimum standards for storage and disposal of this hazardous waste that can be applied at DOE sites and commercial waste treatment facilities throughout the country.

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 1991	$2,527,082,000
Budget estimate, 1992	2,821,428,000
House allowance	2,854,053,000
Committee recommendation	2,940,916,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,940,916,000 for energy supply, research, and development activities. The purpose of these funds is to support the development of new energy technologies and improve the efficiency of existing technologies. Included are the development and demonstration of solar energy, wind, ocean systems, biomass, geothermal, nuclear fission and fusion, electric energy systems, and energy storage. Efforts associated with basic energy sciences, environmental and biological research, and university and other support programs are also included.

These programs address the development of both short- and longer-term energy supply options to provide the energy resources needed for sustained national growth and to alleviate our dependence on fossil fuels and foreign oil.

SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY PROGRAMS

The President's budget proposes an increase of $13,460,000 over the current year's level of funding of $129,418,000 for a total fiscal year 1992 request of $142,878,000 for solar and renewable energy activities. This budget request is a substantial improvement and continues to reverse the downward trend in these programs which have been substantially curtailed over the last 10 years—from about $550,000,000 in 1981 to the fiscal year 1990 proposal of $71,156,000.

The Committee agrees that the marketplace must ultimately decide the future role of the solar and renewable technologies. Most solar and renewables research, however, has not been developed to the point where the private sector alone can be expected to carry forward with its development.

The Committee considers the continuation of activities in solar energy research and development to be a vital component in a balanced energy program. With a sustained commitment of the scientific and engineering talents in Government and private sector organizations, research progress can establish the knowledge and materials base required for the effective application of a new generation of solar technologies.

Accordingly, the Committee recommends program funds and staffing levels to assure progress in this research activity. The Committee recommendation for solar energy is $158,866,000 which is almost $16,000,000 above the budget request.

Solar building systems.—The Committee recommends $2,000,000 for solar building energy systems, $1,000,000 above the budget request and the same as the House allowance. The Committee recommendation will permit the accelerated design, development, testing, and evaluation of advanced solar heating concepts and systems as well as the continued study and evaluation of means for effectively integrating solar and nonsolar heating equipment. An additional $1,000,000 is provided for development and demonstration of photovoltaic modules and other advanced renewable energy technologies integrated in the design and construction of utility interactive buildings.

The overall program should be focused on active solar applications for building water heating and space cooling, as well as standards development. A new initiative should be established on a cost-shared basis with industry to increase efficiency of components, glazings, and controls with remaining funding going toward international standards development and incorporating performance ratings in Federal loan and efficiency programs.

A plan advising the Committee how DOE intends to support solar buildings and advanced research and how to meld the two complimentary programs into a single program is to be submitted no later than 8 months after enactment of this bill.

Photovoltaic energy systems.—The recommendation includes $56,800,000 for photovoltaic energy systems, which is an increase of $6,000,000 over the budget request and over $10,000,000 above the 1991 level.

The Committee recommendation includes $6,500,000 for a photovoltaic utility initiative, $4,000,000 of which shall support the photovoltaic utility scale application [PVUSA] project. The remaining $2,500,000 shall be divided equally between utility interactive photovoltaic demonstration projects, including building-related projects, and utility cost-shared scale-up projects.

An additional $1,000,000 is provided for fundamental research on advanced thin film materials, and the Committee recommendation includes $13,000,000 for the photovoltaic manufacturing technology initiative.

The recommendation also includes $2,500,000 for the Polycrystalline Thin-film Materials Program to accelerate the development of large area photovoltaic, polycrystalline thin-film modules, and $1,000,000 is included to continue the Southeast and Southwest regional experiment stations on photovoltaic technologies.

This recommended funding level will continue the highest priority requirements needed to continue progress in reducing costs and improving efficiencies of photovoltaic systems.

As in the past years, the Committee expects the Department to maintain a balanced program of advanced research, materials research, technology development, and systems development.

Solar thermal energy systems.—The Committee recommends $24,019,000 for solar thermal energy to maintain the capability to support the continuation of research both in the DOE laboratories and in the private sector. Of the amount provided, an additional $3,000,000 is for the Department to cost share and support, with industry, a program to commercialize a solar/dish engine with utility and remote systems applications.

The goal of this program is to advance the engineering and scientific understanding of solar thermal technology and to establish the technology base from which private industry can develop solar thermal production options for introduction into the energy market. These funds are to be applied to collection technology, energy conversion technology, and systems and application technology.

Biofuels energy systems.—The Committee recommends $36,800,000 for the biofuels energy systems program which is the budget request.

The goal of this program is to conduct research that will provide the technology to increase the supply of domestically available feedstocks and convert those feedstocks to liquid and gaseous fuels.

The Committee recommendation includes an allocation of $1,000,000 for production research, harvesting/processing conversion and market analysis for the Hawaii biofuels program at the Hawaii Natural Energy Institute. Funding of $4,500,000 is allocated for the regional biofuels program which needs greater emphasis on transferring technologies to the private sector. These regional programs include activities related to technology transfer, industry support, resource assessment, and matching local resources to conversion technologies, while noting that the existing focus on commercial direct combustion technologies should be continued.

The Committee allowance includes $6,000,000 for the short rotation woody crops program. The Committee has supported the management of this program by the Department's Oak Ridge National Laboratory and expects that this management authority will continue.

Wind energy systems.—The recommendation provides $17,944,000 for the wind energy program, $4,000,000 more than the budget request. These additional funds will provide for work on the Advanced Wind Turbine Program in the 200 to 750 kilowatt range in cooperation with the private sector. The Committee agrees with the House allocations of $4,000,000 to continue a program to be carried out in cooperation with the private sector to seek new commercial opportunities, both domestically and internationally for wind energy and $1,500,000 to support a cost-shared, industry-utility project to validate and quantify the benefits of distributed utility power generation in which advanced small wind turbine systems are added to the existing utility distribution network at selected sites close to demand centers. The project should be carried out in a region of the country where wind resources have shown a high correlation with utility peak demand periods.

Ocean energy systems.—The Committee provides $2,000,000 for ocean energy systems. Although the tabulation later in this report does not show an amount in the Senate allowance column for ocean energy systems, it is the Committee's intent that this $2,000,000 is to be made available for this purpose from within the total funds made available for the energy supply, research, and development appropriation. The objective of the Ocean Energy Program is to develop a generic technical data base and reduce the technical risks associated with the extraction and use of ocean-derived energy sources to the point that allows industry to judge where and when the technology could be commercialized. Ocean thermal energy conversion may provide a clean, unlimited source of energy, which also provides for aquaculture and fresh water. Of the amount provided, $1,000,000 is for the Natural Energy Laboratory of Hawaii to develop ocean resources and marine materials.

Other solar programs.—The recommendation includes $10,000,000 as requested in the budget for the solar energy research facility at the Solar Energy Research Institute [SERI] in Golden, CO. Last year, the Committee urged the Department of Energy and SERI to incorporate energy conservation, passive solar design, and solar thermal and electric equipment as an integral, as opposed to a demonstration, part of the structure. Further, the Committee requested that if such designs and equipment are judged to be cost competitive and congruent with the primary purpose of the building, they should be installed consonant with the philosophy expressed in section 801(a)1, chapter 141, title X, U.S.C. section 2394 pertaining to the procurement of solar by the Department of Defense in its own projects when cost effective. The Committee is aware that the proposed new facility is of passive design but remains concerned that cost-effective applications of solar water heating and photovoltaics may not be incorporated into the final design.

The Federal interagency export board, the Committee on Renewable Energy Commerce and Trade [CORECT] supports industry export initiatives and overseas liaison offices. The Committee recommendation for the Solar International Program is to agree with the House amount of $2,000,000. The increase in funding shall go to support existing CORECT programs in design assistance and export promotion with the existing industry consortium but excludes fund-

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT					
UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND					
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS					
COLORADO					
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT..................................	359,410,500	27,237,289	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
DOLORES PROJECT..	479,836,000	395,859,834	54,280,000	54,280,000	54,280,000
UTAH					
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, BONNEVILLE UNIT..................	1,649,351,072	1,109,171,154	27,577,000	27,577,000	34,577,000
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, UINTAH UNIT......................	159,830,000	5,845,794	50,000	50,000	50,000
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:					
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS:					
DALLAS CREEK PROJECT................................	131,723,000	119,453,173	186,000	186,000	186,000
RECREATIONAL AND FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES:					
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES..............................	179,454,441	134,655,022	13,642,000	13,642,000	13,642,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES.........................	272,407,190	90,186,639	16,636,000	23,636,000	17,636,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT...........			115,371,000	122,371,000	123,371,000
COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT					
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT					
ARIZONA					
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, WATER DEVELOPMENT (LCRBDF)...	3,220,829,000	2,369,307,045	117,266,000	117,266,000	117,266,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, NON-INDIAN DIST. SYSTEMS.....	303,116,000	239,633,350	517,000	517,000	517,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, SAFETY OF DAMS................	85,750,000	39,896,334	14,950,000	14,950,000	14,950,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT.............			132,733,000	132,733,000	132,733,000
ASSOCIATED ITEMS					
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS...	---	---	-33,300,000	-33,300,000	-30,300,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM......................			546,279,000	553,209,000	564,409,000

ing for energy efficiency which is funded by another subcommittee, as well as programs not related to export promotion.

The Committee does not support the administration's proposed sharp reduction in support of solar technology transfer, particularly given the growing solar energy research and development program at Department of Energy laboratories. The Committee has, therefore, provided $1,000,000 to maintain a steady program of technology transfer, and encourages the Department to seek out innovative approaches to technology transfer with the renewable energy trade associations, State and local governments, and utilities and industrial energy users.

The Committee supports the need of an ongoing resource assessment activity and directs that industry associations be formally contacted for their market needs in assessing resource opportunities.

GEOTHERMAL

The Geothermal Research and Development Program is aimed at resolving technical problems that preclude the private sector from fully developing our vast geothermal resources. The Committee recommends $27,170,000 for geothermal activities, an increase of $2,500,000 over the House allowance.

Geothermal resources include steam, hot water, geopressured methane, hot dry rock, and magma. The geothermal energy research and development program is aimed at resolving the technical problems, which include uncertainties in determining size and life of reservoirs, unusually high drilling costs and lack of well stimulation techniques, the need for injection technology for economic disposal of spent brines, major corrosion and materials problems, environmental problems, and lack of efficient components.

The Committee recognizes the complex nature of the geothermal resource base and the need for developing improved analytical and testing capabilities. The Committee supports continuation of research activities to improve the tools and methods available for addressing the technical challenges associated with locating, evaluating, and extracting geothermal resources.

The recommendation includes $5,000,000 for geopressured resources, to continue the existing contract work in three field wells: Pleasant Bayou, Hulin, and Gladys McCall, to be used to resolve technical issues on production of hydrocarbons and brine and generation of electricity using the energy content of the produced fluids.

The recommendation provides an additional $1,500,000 for hydrothermal reservoir exploration and identification efforts and an additional $3,000,000 for a project to demonstrate the economic benefits of improved electric generators in geothermal applications.

The Committee has approved $1,000,000 to continue research and development of smaller scale applications of byproduct heat from geothermal steam, especially for applications in areas with rich geothermal resources such as Hawaii.

The Committee also provides $300,000 to continue the Geothermal Direct-Heat Utilization Assistance Program at the Geo-Heat Center at the Oregon Institute of Technology.

HYDROPOWER

The Committee has approved the administration's request of $1,043,000 for the hydropower program.

The Committee believes that hydropower is an important domestic renewable energy resource, and supports the maximum utilization of hydropower resources consistent with established environmental policies. The present hydropower licensing process has created duplicate responsibilities among multiple agencies, resulting in excessive licensing and relicensing delays, costs, and uncertainty. The Committee is concerned that this valuable energy resource may be underutilized because of the current regulatory regime and that the threat of the loss of capacity through the relicensing process means that it is no longer possible to incorporate hydropower resources in future capacity plans with confidence. To begin the remedy of these problems, the Secretary is urged to establish a hydropower office within the Office of Policy and Planning and funds are made available to be used for the following objectives: (1) To advocate the use of hydropower as a domestic resource in national energy policy planning; (2) to work with other Federal and State agencies to eliminate duplication of regulatory roles and to work with other Federal and State agencies to foster cooperation between competing river uses; and (3) to coordinate hydropower energy policy objectives with the Director of Renewable Energy Technologies to encourage research and development of cost-effective mitigation measures that adequately protect the environment while not hampering hydropower development.

ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE

The Committee recommends $38,003,000 the same amount as the House, for electric energy systems and electric energy storage.

The electric energy systems and storage program includes research in determining the effects of electric power transmission on humans and animals; development of technology for improving the reliability of the transmission and distribution of electricity; and research and development in systems technology and thermal and chemical storage.

Electric energy systems.—A total of $30,757,000 is provided for electric energy systems, the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

The Committee allocation for electrical field effects research is for $5,000,000 to upgrade the level of DOE research on the interaction of electromagnetic energy with biological systems. An increasing concern is the potential health effects results from exposure to electrical or magnetic fields. These additional funds will advance important research and studies conducted by the Department of Energy.

The Committee recommendation includes an increase of $3,000,000 over the budget for the superconductivity pilot centers to continue the transfer of technology from the national laboratories to U.S. industry.

The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 to support a cost-shared, industry-utility project to evaluate the use of distributed utility power generation, utilizing renewable energy systems, for improving power system performance, and generating transmission and distribution savings.

The Committee directs the Department to work with representatives of the solar and wind energy industries to develop an analysis of the need for transmission capacity, whether new or upgraded, to support the development of renewable energy resources. The Department should consult with the power marketing administrations in developing the plan. The Committee believes the Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference Committee Blackfeet Area Wind Integration Study primarily achieves the objectives of this provision for the Pacific Northwest.

An amount of $7,246,000 is included for energy storage, the same as the House and the budget request.

NUCLEAR ENERGY R&D PROGRAM

A total of $345,958,000 is provided for the Nuclear Energy Research and Development Program, $36,000,000 more than the House allowance and $52,000,000 less than the budget request.

Funds are included for civilian reactor research, space and defense power systems, and civilian waste research and development. This Committee agrees with the House Committee and also continues to be concerned about the future of the nuclear power option in the United States. The strategic plan for the nuclear reactor research and development program remains unfinished, and the program appears to lack focus and direction. The budget proposal for civilian nuclear research remains heavily skewed toward space and defense activities, and facility mortgages consume a significant portion of the remaining resources.

The Committee also supports the Department's participation with industry to develop a reactor life extension plan and the development of standard reactor designs certified by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for construction and operation.

Light water reactors [LWR].—An amount of $62,500,000 is recommended for improved LWR technology, which is the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

The Committee continues to support the Department's efforts to work with the electric power industry to develop and certify designs for advanced nuclear reactors with enhanced safety features, including passive designs. The Committee is pleased that the Department has responded to the Committee's directive to initiate a first-of-a-kind [FOAK] engineering program with industry teams on a cost-shared basis, starting in fiscal year 1992 and concluding in fiscal year 1995. The FOAK engineering program will provide the certainty in design, costs, and schedules required by the utility industry before it will commit to new orders. In this regard, the Committee is encouraged by the goal of being able to order new plants by mid-1990's, as provided by the national energy strategy [NES] and the industry's "Strategic Plan For Building New Nuclear Energy Plants." Therefore, the Committee approves the Department's budget request of $20,000,000 in fiscal year 1992 for the FOAK engineering program.

The Committee agrees with the Department's proposal to cost share the funding for this program, on a 50–50 cost-shared basis, from non-Federal sources for one or more designs. We further believe that the program should be initiated based on a competitive request for proposals: where the industry or market interest is evidenced by an entity's ability to achieve the required level of cost sharing; if the design set forth in the response is a part of DOE's program for NRC design certification; and to the extent that first-of-a-kind engineering on the design set forth in the response will contribute to the standardization of the design and its construction.

Advanced reactor research and development.—The Committee recommends $59,539,000 for advanced reactor R&D, $10,000,000 more than the House allowance.

The Committee recommendation approves the budget request for the Integral Fast Reactor and the Actinide Recycle Program. An increase of $10,000,000 is approved for the civilian modular high temperature gas reactor [MHTGR] providing a total of $16,000,000 for the fiscal year 1992 program.

The allowance also includes $3,500,000, the same as the House allowance, for the university research program in robotics for advanced reactors. The Committee has included funds for university nuclear engineering in the university research support program carried in another activity under this appropriation heading.

Space programs.—The Committee recommendation provides $44,000,000 for space reactor power systems, a $12,000,000 reduction from the budget requested amount and an increase of $8,000,000 over the House allowance. The Committee notes the increased interest of the Department of Defense in thermionics technology and supports the funding requested for that program.

For the advanced radioisotope power system, the allowance would restore the House reduction, providing the same as the budget request of $56,000,000. These funds provide radioisotope thermoelectric generators for NASA programs and DOD programs.

The Committee recommendation provides $10,000,000 of the administration's request to fund the power development portion of the President's space exploration initiative [SEI]. The DOE's proposed component of the President's SEI is a cooperative program with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to develop and test new power systems required to support human exploration of the solar system. The Committee observes that the Department of Energy is the agency of the Government charged with the development of power production technologies and is the logical and correct choice to support the development of power sources for NASA. The Committee would not welcome the inherent waste of resources from the duplication of DOE's expertise in NASA or any other agency of the Government. The Committee directs DOE to work with NASA to avoid duplication of effort especially in areas of DOE's special expertise in energy technologies, planetary environmental sensing, and manufacturing techniques for advanced materials and shielding applications. The Committee encourages cost sharing from NASA to ensure that DOE's program efforts are tightly linked to NASA's needs. The Committee also supports the Department's proposal to combine its program for NASA with further studies of solar power production in space for use on Earth. The recommended allowance will enable the Department to initiate its activities to insure that the power production development role and expertise is effectively advanced in the cooperative program.

Facilities.—The Committee recommendation provides a total of $97,819,000 for the facilities account. This allowance is a decrease of $30,000,000 below the budget request.

The bill provides for the operation of the fast flux test reactor [FFTF] in fiscal year 1992, providing funding of the reactor in the environmental restoration and waste management program.

OFFICE OF NUCLEAR SAFETY

The Committee recommends $12,530,000 the same as the amended budget request to provide support for this office in the Department of Energy. This organization reports directly to the Secretary and was established to monitor and audit all aspects of nuclear safety, including field office and contractor performance. This office reviews and concurs in nuclear reactor and nonreactor nuclear facility safety policies and is responsible for enforcement policy and programs associated with the civil and criminal penalty authority of the Price/Anderson Act Amendments of 1988.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY, AND HEALTH

The Committee recommends $159,670,000 for environment, safety, and health activities, which is the same as the House appropriation and the budget request.

The Environment, Safety and Health [ES&H] Program was established to assure protection of the environment, safety of DOE workers and the public, and protection of DOE property. The ES&H Program implements these goals by defining DOE policy, providing guidance and technical assistance, performing safety-related research of a generic nature and performing independent overview and assessment.

LIQUEFIED GASEOUS FUELS SPILL TEST FACILITY

The Committee recommends $1,115,000 to continue baseline operations support and for facility maintenance, research and development, and technical interaction with potential sponsors of research. This is the same as the budget request and House allowance.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The Committee recommends $332,560,000 for biological and environmental research, $20,000,000 over the House-passed allowance.

This program has two main objectives: (1) To develop the knowledge base necessary to identify, understand, and anticipate the long-term health and environmental consequences of energy use and development; and (2) to utilize the Department's unique scientific and technological capabilities to solve major scientific problems in medicine and biology.

Global change.—The Committee strongly supports the Department's efforts to accelerate global warming research, particularly those initiatives which seek to rapidly improve the capability to predict global and regional climate change. The Committee, therefore, has provided the full $74,500,000 requested by the administration.

All global warming research funds, including those made available to the Institute and its components shall primarily support the Department's high priority initiatives to rapidly improve the capability to predict global and regional climate change.

Human genome project.—The study of the human genome, the genetic instructions for the development and functioning of the human body, increases in fiscal year 1992. The Department has requested an increase of $11,200,000 for the project, bringing the fiscal year 1992 proposed total to $56,800,000. The Committee has been supportive of this major project, and believes that the Department and its national laboratories have an important role in this effort. The Committee, therefore, has provided the full amount requested for the project.

The short-term goal of the DOE human genome program is to provide the computational, engineering, and biological capabilities needed to both reduce the cost of analysis of DNA as well as increase the speed of analysis. The long-term goal is to construct high resolution physical maps of the human chromosomes, the ultimate map being the DNA sequence. DOE's research on the human genome stems from the Department's mission to evaluate the health effects of energy systems. DOE and the National Institutes of Health are the two Federal agencies with primary responsibility for the human genome initiative. The DOE centers for this genome research are the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, and the Los Alamos National Laboratory.

Boron neutron capture therapy.—The Committee has deleted the House bill language transferring $7,500,000 of the fiscal year 1991 appropriation for this program to fund the research program in fiscal year 1992. The Committee directs the Department to review the funding requirements to carry out the research program for the period fiscal years 1992–95 as well as for the reactor modifications required with a funding profile, for the same period, and submit its findings and recommendations no later than August 30, 1991, to enable the Committee to consider further action during this session of the Congress.

Nuclear medicine program.—The Committee has approved the full budget request for the nuclear medicine program. The program has yielded a significant return on investment in terms of vastly improved diagnostic and therapeutic technologies that are rapidly transferred to the clinical setting. These advances not only improve the quality of medical care for thousands of people across the country, but they also reduce total U.S. health care expenditures by reducing hospitalization time, improving the diagnostic process, and often obviating the need for more costly, more invasive therapies such as cardiac catheterization and bypass surgery. The program has produced remarkable technological breakthroughs with a relatively small budget.

The Committee is aware of the Department's growing role in the Nation's structural biology research programs. The Department, and its national laboratories, have a unique role to play in this rapidly growing field. Using the Department's new synchrotron radiation sources now under construction, scientists will be able to more closely examine biological structures to further define their functions. This work is critical to future improvements in our Nation's health care, and builds on the Department's traditional strengths in biological imaging technology development. The Committee strongly supports the Department's growing role in this area.

Facilities.—Project 87–R–130, Center for Molecular Medicine and Immunology, Institute for Nuclear Medicine Research facility, may proceed with purchase or renovation plans for the new facility under a 3-year grant extension with a phased-in construction plan. Given the critical needs in New Jersey, the Committee authorizes construction to begin immediately under a modified proposal for the non-Federal share. The center has already acquired land and buildings valued at $2,400,000 and has raised an additional $500,000 privately. This, along with the contribution of maintenance services, will constitute the non-Federal share.

The Committee recommends $10,000,000 for an ambulatory research and education building at the Oregon Health Sciences University. These funds will be used for design and construction, and may also be used for equipment acquisition to the extent that federally funded equipment is offset by non-Federal matching funds. This project is complimentary to the Neurosensory Research Center and will provide the initial funding for a new ambulatory research facility to further the development of clinical applications in the specific fields, and upgrade the condition of the existing ambulatory teaching facilities. The facility will enable the university to develop the ambulatory research opportunities in three of its centers of emphasis, neuroscience, oncology, and endocrinology and metabolic disorders, and will facilitate the transition from bench research to clinical applications. It is the Committee's understanding that no continuing operating funds will be requested or required to support the facility.

The bill recommended by the Committee includes $6,000,000 to complete project 89–R–121, the Biomedical Research Institute, LSU Medical Center in Shreveport, LA. The Biomedical Research Institute is supported and operated as a public-private partnership by the Biomedical Research Foundation, the Louisiana State University system, and the State of Louisiana. Through this partnership, the Federal Government is providing funds to construct a state-of-the-art facility which will house and conduct major specialized research and programs for cardiovascular disease, molecular biology, and neurobiology. The funds included herein will complete six state-of-the-art core research laboratories for monoclonal antibody production, oligonucleotide and peptide synthesis gene cloning, DNA sequencing, high performance liquid chromotography, tissue culture, and positron emission tomography. Research projects will be jointly sponsored by the foundation, the medical center, and industry. The Committee notes that the foundation increased the operating endowment goal to $5,000,000 and that the community's two largest private hospitals have contributed endowed chairs (each valued at $1,000,000) to support research connected with the positron emission tomography system. The Committee also notes that the State of Louisiana has made available $8,750,000 in equipment funding for the institute. It is the Committee's understanding that no continuing operating funds will be requested or required to support the facility.

The recommendation also provides $4,800,000 for the Medical University of South Carolina's Cancer/Oncology Center. The MUSC Center has recently been selected by the Department of Energy to establish a cancer and birth defect surveillance system covering communities near the DOE's Savannah River site. These funds will provide the necessary equipment for support of the cancer registry, and the epidemiology laboratory, and other activities of the center.

SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

The budget request proposes $801,658,000 for supporting research and technical analysis including basic energy sciences, multiprogram facility support, oversight, analysis, and university support. The Committee provides $851,158,000 for these activities, an increase of $49,500,000 over the budget request and $47,000,000 more than the House.

Basic energy sciences.—A total of $737,700,000 is recommended for basic energy sciences, an increase of $23,000,000 above the budget request and the House allowance, as shown in the following programs and activities.

Materials science.—The Committee recommends an additional $5,000,000 which will provide for a total of $262,116,000 in fiscal year 1992 for the materials sciences program.

The Committee recommends an additional $5,000,000 for materials synthesis and processing.

High performance computing.—The Department has requested $93,000,000 for its share of the High-Performance Computing and Communications Program [HPCC] which the administration has proposed for fiscal year 1992. This represents a $28,000,000 increase for the Department in civilian high-performance computing activities from fiscal year 1991. The Committee believes that the HPCC Program is an extremely important Federal investment in high-performance computing and communications technologies, which are critical to the competitiveness and national security of the United States.

The Committee believes, however, that the Department's role in this program should be substantially larger. Historically, the Department has been the lead Federal agency in the development and use of high-performance computing technologies. The Department operates more unclassified supercomputers than any other entity in the world and has working relationships between its national laboratories and most of the high-performance computing vendors. Considering the Department's extensive expertise and resources in high-performance computing, the Department should have at least an equal, if not larger, role in the high-performance computing initiative than the other agencies.

The Department and its national laboratories are in a position to help the United States maintain its leadership, strengthen the U.S. computing industry, and encourage deployment of high-performance computing in U.S. industry. In the past, the Department accomplished this role almost entirely with the financial support of the nuclear weapons research, development, and testing program. The Department, to the extent appropriate, should continue to support high-performance computing activities through the nuclear weapons program.

Today, the Department's contributions extend to an even broader spectrum, including such areas as the human genome project, new types of fuel combustion, global climate modeling, materials science, fundamental physics research, and enhanced oil recovery. All of these areas require the most sophisticated high-performance computing technology available. Using these applications, the Department can continue to push forward high-performance computing technologies.

The Department's role in the advancement of high-performance computing technology has been principally as a user and customer, rather than as a developer. The Committee believes this to be an appropriate way for the Department to support the HPCC Program. Legislation pending in the Senate (S. 343, S. Rept. 102-64) directs the Department to support the HPCC Program in its role as a user of high-performance computing technology.

To support its primary missions the Department will no doubt sponsor research into novel computer system architectures. Because of the national importance of this initiative, the Committee believes it important that all types of high-performance computing technology be supported. For example, while massively parallel computer architectures offer promise for huge gains in computational speed and power for certain applications, there are also new types of vector processors and competing parallel solutions, both developed commercially, which offer similar promise for other applications. Also other experimental concepts offer even larger potential gains such as with optoelectronics and neural nets. In supporting new types of high-performance computing technologies, the Department should ensure that its sponsorship does not translate into actual or defacto advocacy of the sponsored products.

In carrying out the HPCC Program, the Department may acquire prototype or early production models of new high-performance computer and communications research systems and subsystems to stimulate hardware and software development and may use operating funds for such acquisitions. However, full, fair, and open competition should be used for all acquisitions other than those for prototype or early production models.

Advanced energy projects.—The Committee is aware of the proposal for the cost-shared Advanced Technologies Institutes facility for the University of Connecticut's affiliated research and technology park. The State is to provide matching funds for this facility and contributions from the private sector for the Institutes have been received also. The State expects this to be a major stimulus for the development of the university and for the State's economic future. The Committee recommends $400,000 be provided to the university to assist in the plans and design under the advanced energy projects activity or from other appropriate activity in this appropriation.

The Committee has approved $10,000,000 of the recommended appropriation in the bill for the Institute for Micromanufacturing at Louisiana Tech University. The Manufacturing Systems Engineering Research Center, established in 1988 by the Louisiana Board of Regents and supported by the State; is advancing the knowledge base in micromanufacturing. The focus is applied research emphasizing the design and development, testing, assembly, and production of micron and submicron structures and devices. Its components include a linkage with the electron storage ring at the Center for Advanced Microstructures and Devices [CAMD], performing work associated with the x-ray lithography micromachining capability at CAMD. Other research and development components of this new and revolutionary technology include biomedical engineering and technology transfer.

Cooperative and university research support programs.—The Committee is encouraged by the progress and accomplishments in the partnership programs between DOE national laboratories and historically minority universities and colleges including the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, Ana G. Mendez Educational Foundation, and Jackson State University and directs the Department to provide $4,000,000 in fiscal year 1992 to maintain and support these partnerships.

The Committee agrees that the Department of Energy may utilize the funds provided in fiscal year 1991 for the operation of the Advanced Technology Research Center at Oklahoma State University for the construction of such center.

From within funds made available in applied mathematical science, basic energy sciences, and other energy programs in this account not otherwise discussed in this report, an amount equal to 83 percent of the current fiscal year 1991 amount is to be made available to continue the cooperative agreement between the Department of Energy and the Supercomputer Computations Research Institute [SCRI] located at Florida State University.

The Committee recommendation provides $5,000,000 to be made available, on a competitive basis, to university nuclear engineering programs. These moneys are to be made available for graduate fellowships, direct research support, and educational support programs in the field of nuclear engineering. The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for upgrading and operating of university nuclear research and training reactors.

The Committee is impressed with the progress to date of the DOE/EPSCoR program. Because this program has the potential to make a significant contribution to the Department's ongoing energy research and development efforts, the Committee has provided $5,000,000 to continue that initiative. This funding level will allow a second year of funding for the existing traineeships and the initiation of a merit-based research competition among the designated planning committee. Additional traineeships should also be considered.

In addition to the EPSCoR program traineeships, the Department should consider additional graduate traineeships to help broaden the availability of high-quality science education and opportunities for professional scientific training in energy-related fields for all programs under the jurisdiction of the Office of Energy Research including the general sciences program and SSC.

Laboratory technology R&D transfer.—The Committee has provided $20,000,000 for a new technology research program within the Office of Energy Research. The Committee has been concerned that the Department's implementation of recent technology transfer legislation has not paid sufficient attention to, or provided a specific source of funding for, research on generic, precompetitive technologies that are broadly beneficial to the entire American economy.

The recent National Critical Technologies Panel report identifies numerous technological areas which require a long-range commitment to multidisciplinary research, which is not now being supported or carried out by American industries or universities. The short investment horizon of industry and the narrow specialization of university research may result in missed opportunities unless the appropriate resources of the Federal research agencies are brought to bear.

Some of the areas in the report are directly related to the Department of Energy's energy and environment missions. Others such as micro- and nanofabrication, optoelectronics, artificially structured materials, and advanced synthesis and processing techniques are not so clearly related to these missions. However, the Department's investments in multidisciplinary basic research at its national laboratories and their unique user facilities provide a foundation for collaborations with industry and universities to explore technology applications beyond the energy and environment missions. Technology research will require many of the same conceptual and instrumental tools now used in scientific research. In the early stages of this effort the coupling between fundamental research and applications research will be close, sometimes indistinguishable, thus the name, technology research.

A good example of such research is nanoscale materials. Advances in computing and electronics have been driven by the ability of the semiconductor industry to pack silicon chips with more circuits made of smaller features. The limiting factors have been the properties of the materials used and the processes to assemble the materials. Currently the industry can write micron-sized features. Advanced lithography technology would reduce these by a factor of 10. Nanoscale materials would be 1,000 times smaller. Assembling and connecting such features requires the ability to move materials essentially an atom at a time. Thin films made of many layers, each an atom or two thick, could be used for batteries or hydrogen storage. We can make such features in the laboratory now but not always reproducibly. An economically competitive product will require a fundamental understanding of the behavior of materials at such small dimensions, and breakthroughs in the production techniques. Carrying out this research will require unique facilities and a coordinated research program in physics, chemistry, and engineering managed with an ultimate view toward the applications.

The DOE national laboratories have the facilities, the human resources, and the tradition of serving national needs that can be brought to bear on such problems. As a result, the Committee directs the Department to establish a new technology research program. The first goal of the program is support of long-term technology research at the DOE national laboratories. Industrial participation in these programs is expected through advisory committees and boards, exchange of scientists or contribution of funding, equipment, or materials. Due to the long-range investment horizon of this research, the Department should take a flexible approach to the levels and types of industrial participation. This research would explore scientific discoveries with an emphasis on their broad application for industrial products and processes. It is understood that the payoff from this research may occur in a 10- to 15-year timeframe.

The second goal of the technology research program is support for near-term laboratory-industry collaborations to move technological innovations to the market. Support would be available for cooperative research and development agreements [CRADA's]. Other targets include national laboratory-developed technology where a clear market opportunity exists, but additional work is required before a specific industrial investor is identified.

The Department is expected to report annually to the Congress on the activities funded through this program, and on specific technologies adopted by the private sector.

The Committee recommendation includes $100,000 for Rural Enterprises, Inc., a tax-exempt, nonprofit technology transfer center in Oklahoma, to continue a technology transfer demonstration project for the Department of Energy that will attempt to draw prime candidates for transfer to other private and public sector entities, put a system in place for drawing upon these resources, and transfer DOE technologies to private and public sector entities.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT (NONDEFENSE)

The Committee action recommends $602,495,000 which increases the proposed nondefense program by $79,000,000. This increase will provide for the full-year operation of the Fast Flux Test Reactor [FFTF] and allow research to continue on a number of programs including research on actinide burning. The Committee remains concerned, however, about the long-term future missions for FFTF. For this reason, the Committee supports the efforts of a commercialization team sponsored by the Governor of Washington State and the Department of Energy that is currently working to identify private sources who are willing to contribute to the operating costs of FFTF in exchange for valuable industrial and medical isotopes and irradiation services. It is anticipated that this marketing effort will be completed by the end of March 1992. The goal of the marketing team is to attract private and international partners to share the costs and the benefits of the FFTF. It is understood that if this marketing effort is not successful by March 31, 1992, the recommended fiscal year 1992 operating funds will be redirected to adequately fund orderly shutdown of the facility.

Uranium mill tailings.—The Committee recommends $139,900,000 for the uranium mill tailings remedial action program, which is the level of the budget request.

The Committee expects that the funds provided for uranium mill tailings remedial cleanup activities will be effectively applied to those remediation sites where work is ongoing and near completion, as well as those sites that are ready to proceed in fiscal year 1992, except for emergency situations, where health and safety requirements dictate otherwise. The Committee further notes that the cooperation of the Bureau of Land Management and the States in many of the remedial action activities is essential to the expeditious and cost-effective completion of this work.

Nearly all of the funding and activity in this program have been associated with surface cleanup efforts. The fiscal year 1992 budget request includes only $2,000,000 for ground water contamination work. The Committee believes the Department should proceed with characterization and evaluation studies and work on ground water contamination as soon as possible. The Committee is advised that the Department considers ground water contamination at the Falls City, TX, site to be probably the worst of the sites nationwide. Therefore, the Department should again consider a pilot program for the Falls City site and allocate additional funds to initiate this work in the upcoming fiscal year.

The Committee has been advised that the Central Valley Water Reclamation Board has been trying to obtain release of the uranium mill tailings remedial action [UMTRA] Vitro site in Salt Lake, UT, since 1987, when the tailings were removed. The board is anxious to develop the site, since revenues from the development are an anticipated source of funds for the payment to Tooele County for the deposit of mill tailings. To expedite the release of this site, DOE is directed to spend $100,000 on a ground water and soil contamination study at the Vitro site. If DOE is unable to conduct a ground water and soil contamination study for $100,000, the funds must be transferred to the State department of health services to conduct the study. If the ground water and soil at the Vitro site is contaminated DOE shall immediately prepare an action plan with the concurrence of local agencies and implement an effective remediation to a full unrestricted productive use.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

The following tabulation shows the Committee's recommendation by program for new budget authority in comparison with the current year, the budget estimate, and the House allowance:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT				
I. Solar applications				
A. Solar building technology research				
Operating expenses	1,974,000	1,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
B. Photovoltaic energy systems				
Operating expenses	45,517,000	49,300,000	58,900,000	55,300,000
Capital equipment	790,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Subtotal, Photovoltaic energy systems	46,307,000	50,800,000	60,400,000	56,800,000
C. Solar thermal energy systems				
Operating expenses	19,105,000	19,569,000	28,650,000	23,569,000
Capital equipment	148,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
Subtotal, Solar thermal energy system	19,253,000	20,019,000	29,100,000	24,019,000
D. Biofuels energy systems				
Operating expenses	32,139,000	32,500,000	35,000,000	32,500,000
Capital equipment	988,000	4,300,000	4,300,000	4,300,000
Subtotal, Biofuels energy systems	33,127,000	36,800,000	39,300,000	36,800,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
E. Wind energy systems				
Operating expenses	10,861,000	13,744,000	21,200,000	17,744,000
Capital equipment	198,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Subtotal, Wind energy systems	11,059,000	13,944,000	21,400,000	17,944,000
F. Ocean energy systems				
Operating expenses	2,715,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Solar applications	114,435,000	122,563,000	152,200,000	137,563,000
II. Other solar energy				
A. International solar energy program - OE	1,481,000	1,500,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
B. Solar technology transfer				
Operating expenses	2,195,000	512,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
C. Solar Energy Research Institute				
Capital equipment	406,000	340,000	340,000	340,000
Construction:				
General plant projects	286,000	1,165,000	1,165,000	1,165,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
91-E-100 Solar energy research fac. (SERF)..	4,443,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Subtotal, Construction........................	4,729,000	11,165,000	11,165,000	11,165,000
Subtotal, Solar Energy Research Institute.........	5,135,000	11,505,000	11,505,000	11,505,000
D. Resource assessment				
Operating expenses............................	938,000	1,110,000	1,110,000	1,110,000
Capital equipment.............................	50,000	90,000	90,000	90,000
Subtotal, Resource assessment.....................	988,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
E. Program support - OE..........................	889,000	936,000	936,000	936,000
F. Program direction - OE.........................	4,295,000	4,662,000	4,662,000	4,662,000
Subtotal, Other solar energy.........................	14,983,000	20,315,000	21,303,000	21,303,000
TOTAL, SOLAR ENERGY................................	129,418,000	142,878,000	173,503,000	158,866,000
(Operating expenses)................................	(122,109,000)	(124,833,000)	(155,458,000)	(140,821,000)
(Capital equipment)................................	(2,580,000)	(6,880,000)	(6,880,000)	(6,880,000)
(Construction)................................	(4,729,000)	(11,165,000)	(11,165,000)	(11,165,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
GEOTHERMAL				
I. Geopressured research				
Operating expenses	5,924,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	5,000,000
II. Geothermal technology development				
Operating expenses	20,038,000	15,886,000	20,386,000	20,386,000
Capital equipment	401,000	821,000	821,000	821,000
Subtotal, Geothermal technology development	20,439,000	16,707,000	21,207,000	21,207,000
III. Program direction - OE	889,000	963,000	963,000	963,000
TOTAL, GEOTHERMAL	27,252,000	20,170,000	24,670,000	27,170,000
(Operating expenses)	(26,851,000)	(19,349,000)	(23,849,000)	(26,349,000)
(Capital equipment)	(401,000)	(821,000)	(821,000)	(821,000)
HYDROPOWER				
I. Small scale hydropower development - OE	909,000	957,000	957,000	957,000
II. Program direction - OE	80,000	86,000	86,000	86,000
TOTAL, HYDROPOWER	989,000	1,043,000	1,043,000	1,043,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE				
I. Electric energy systems				
A. Electric field effects research				
Operating expenses	3,456,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
B. Reliability research				
Operating expenses	1,552,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
C. System and materials research				
Operating expenses	21,485,000	21,100,000	21,100,000	21,100,000
Capital equipment	889,000	900,000	900,000	900,000
Subtotal, System and materials research	22,374,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000
D. Program direction - OE	606,000	657,000	657,000	657,000
Subtotal, Electric energy systems	27,988,000	30,757,000	30,757,000	30,757,000
II. Energy Storage Systems				
A. Battery storage				
Operating expenses	9,074,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
Capital equipment	296,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Subtotal, Battery storage	9,370,000	3,400,000	3,400,000	3,400,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
B. Thermal and chemical storage				
Operating expenses	2,963,000	3,400,000	3,400,000	3,400,000
C. Program direction - OE	413,000	446,000	446,000	446,000
Subtotal, Energy storage systems	12,746,000	7,246,000	7,246,000	7,246,000
TOTAL, ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE	40,734,000	38,003,000	38,003,000	38,003,000
(Operating expenses)	(39,549,000)	(36,903,000)	(36,903,000)	(36,903,000)
(Capital equipment)	(1,185,000)	(1,100,000)	(1,100,000)	(1,100,000)
NUCLEAR				
I. Nuclear energy R & D				
A. Light water reactor				
Operating expenses	38,276,000	62,500,000	62,500,000	62,500,000
B. Advanced reactor R & D				
Operating expenses	54,680,000	48,539,000	48,539,000	58,539,000
Capital equipment	1,988,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal, Advanced reactor R & D	56,668,000	49,539,000	49,539,000	59,539,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
C. Space reactor power systems				
Operating expenses	21,912,000	53,180,000	33,180,000	41,180,000
Capital equipment	2,147,000	2,120,000	2,120,000	2,120,000
Construction:				
86-N-105 SP-100 fac. mods - HEDL	9,246,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
Subtotal, Space reactor power systems	33,305,000	56,000,000	36,000,000	44,000,000
D. Advanced radioisotope power system				
Operating expenses	55,177,000	49,000,000	41,000,000	49,000,000
Capital equipment	6,363,000	7,000,000	5,000,000	7,000,000
Construction:				
89-N-111 RPSF	13,521,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Advanced radioisotope power system	75,061,000	56,000,000	46,000,000	56,000,000
E. Space exploration initiative				
Operating expenses	---	29,000,000	---	9,000,000
Capital equipment	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
Subtotal, Space exploration initiative	---	30,000,000	---	10,000,000
F. Facilities				
Operating expenses	82,595,000	113,569,000	85,569,000	83,569,000
Capital equipment	2,287,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Construction:				
92-E-200 Mods to reactors	---	5,850,000	5,850,000	5,850,000
91-N-201 Modifications to reactors	2,187,000	---	---	---
GPN-102 GPP	2,994,000	3,600,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
89-N-115 Fire suf. imp., ANL	1,889,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Subtotal, Construction	7,070,000	11,450,000	11,450,000	11,450,000
Subtotal, Facilities	91,952,000	127,819,000	99,819,000	97,819,000
G. Program direction - OE	8,749,000	16,100,000	16,100,000	16,100,000
Subtotal, Nuclear energy R & D	304,011,000	397,958,000	309,958,000	345,958,000
(Operating expenses)	(261,389,000)	(371,888,000)	(286,888,000)	(319,888,000)
(Capital equipment)	(12,785,000)	(13,920,000)	(10,920,000)	(13,920,000)
(Construction)	(29,837,000)	(12,150,000)	(12,150,000)	(12,150,000)
II. Civilian waste R & D				
A. Spent fuel storage R & D				
Operating expenses	587,000	590,000	4,590,000	590,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
B. Program direction	109,000	110,000	110,000	110,000
Subtotal, Civilian waste R & D	696,000	700,000	4,700,000	700,000
TOTAL, NUCLEAR	304,707,000	398,658,000	314,658,000	346,658,000
(Operating expenses)	(262,085,000)	(372,588,000)	(291,588,000)	(320,588,000)
(Capital equipment)	(12,785,000)	(13,920,000)	(10,920,000)	(13,920,000)
(Construction)	(29,837,000)	(12,150,000)	(12,150,000)	(12,150,000)
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH				
I. Environment, safety and health				
Operating expenses	102,281,000	158,070,000	158,070,000	158,070,000
Capital equipment	1,533,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	103,814,000	159,670,000	159,670,000	159,670,000
OFFICE OF NUCLEAR SAFETY				
I. Nuclear safety				
Operating expenses	5,965,000	12,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000
Capital equipment	---	30,000	30,000	30,000
TOTAL, OFFICE OF NUCLEAR SAFETY	5,965,000	12,530,000	12,530,000	12,530,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
LIQUEFIED GASEOUS SPILL TEST FACILITY				
I. Spill test facility				
Operating expenses	1,079,000	1,115,000	1,115,000	1,115,000
ENVIRONMENT R & D				
I. Biological and environmental research				
Operating expenses	373,314,000	286,128,000	286,128,000	306,128,000
Capital equipment	11,553,000	16,832,000	16,832,000	16,832,000
Construction:				
GP-E-120 General plant projects	3,465,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Subtotal, Biological and environmental research	388,332,000	306,460,000	306,460,000	326,460,000
II. Program direction	5,540,000	6,100,000	6,100,000	6,100,000
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT R & D	393,872,000	312,560,000	312,560,000	332,560,000
(Operating expenses)	(378,854,000)	(292,228,000)	(292,228,000)	(312,228,000)
(Capital equipment)	(11,553,000)	(16,832,000)	(16,832,000)	(16,832,000)
(Construction)	(3,465,000)	(3,500,000)	(3,500,000)	(3,500,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
FUSION				
I. Fusion Energy				
A. Confinement systems	138,199,000	183,250,000	183,250,000	183,250,000
B. Development and technology	41,601,000	56,650,000	56,650,000	56,650,000
C. Applied plasma physics	60,128,000	61,750,000	61,750,000	61,750,000
D. Planning and projects	4,225,000	4,250,000	4,250,000	4,250,000
E. Inertial fusion energy	980,000	8,150,000	8,150,000	8,150,000
F. Program direction - OE	5,461,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
G. Capital equipment	11,182,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
H. Construction:				
GPP-900 General plant projects	6,263,000	1,950,000	1,950,000	1,950,000
92-E-340 Fire and safety protection improvements	---	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
89-R-800 Confinement physics res facility	5,518,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	11,781,000	4,550,000	4,550,000	4,550,000
TOTAL, FUSION	273,557,000	337,100,000	337,100,000	337,100,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(Operating expenses)	(250,594,000)	(321,550,000)	(321,550,000)	(321,550,000)
(Capital equipment)	(11,182,000)	(11,000,000)	(11,000,000)	(11,000,000)
(Construction)	(11,781,000)	(4,550,000)	(4,550,000)	(4,550,000)
SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS				
I. Basic energy sciences				
A. Materials sciences	274,946,000	257,116,000	257,116,000	262,116,000
B. Chemical sciences	157,585,000	158,300,000	158,300,000	159,300,000
C. Applied mathematical sciences	52,704,000	75,500,000	75,500,000	81,500,000
D. Engineering and geosciences	34,299,000	35,800,000	35,800,000	36,800,000
E. Advanced energy projects	24,855,000	10,800,000	10,800,000	20,800,000
F. Energy biosciences	22,075,000	24,700,000	24,700,000	24,700,000
G. Program direction - CE	6,058,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
H. Capital equipment	36,804,000	37,000,000	37,000,000	37,000,000
I. Construction:				
92-E-332 Accelerator improvements	---	6,626,000	6,626,000	6,626,000
91-E-314 AIT:	6,924,000	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
GPE-400 General plant projects..................	3,051,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
89-R-402 6-7 GeV syn. radiation source..........	69,593,000	90,360,000	90,360,000	90,360,000
87-R-406 1-2 GeV synch rad sc, LBL..............	22,866,000	6,498,000	6,498,000	6,498,000
Subtotal, Construction............................	102,434,000	107,984,000	107,984,000	107,984,000
Subtotal, Basic energy sciences......................	711,760,000	714,700,000	714,700,000	737,700,000
(Operating expenses)................................	(572,522,000)	(569,716,000)	(569,716,000)	(592,716,000)
(Capital equipment)................................	(36,804,000)	(37,000,000)	(37,000,000)	(37,000,000)
(Construction)................................	(102,434,000)	(107,984,000)	(107,984,000)	(107,984,000)
II. Energy research and university support				
A. Energy research analyses - OE.................	3,659,000	4,026,000	4,026,000	4,026,000
B. University and science education programs - OE				
1. Laboratory coop science education ctrs......	24,030,000	27,563,000	29,063,000	32,063,000
2. University program..........................	11,900,000	7,750,000	7,750,000	12,750,000
3. University reactor fuel assistance..........	3,205,000	3,730,000	3,730,000	3,730,000
4. University research instrumentation.........	4,895,000	4,998,000	5,998,000	5,998,000
Subtotal, University & science education programs.	44,030,000	44,041,000	46,541,000	54,541,000
C. Laboratory technology R&D transfer............	2,586,000	4,900,000	4,900,000	20,900,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
D. Advisory and oversight - OE....................	4,222,000	10,100,000	10,100,000	10,100,000
Subtotal, Energy research and university support......	54,497,000	63,067,000	65,567,000	89,567,000
III. Multiprogram energy laboratories - facility sup				
A. Multiprogram general purpose facilities				
92-E-309 Sanitary system mod (BNL) - phase I	---	1,238,000	1,238,000	1,238,000
92-E-312 Roof replacement (LBL) - phase I...	---	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
92-E-321 Fire safety improve (ANL)..........	---	603,000	603,000	603,000
92-E-322 East canyon electrical safety (LBL)	---	377,000	377,000	377,000
92-E-323 Upgrade steam distrib. (ORNL)......	---	1,080,000	1,080,000	1,080,000
92-E-324 Bldg. 326 life safety compli (PNL).	---	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
92-E-326 Transformer switchgear upgrade (BNL	---	3,300,000	3,300,000	3,300,000
92-E-329 Substation upgrades & improvements	---	500,000	500,000	500,000
92-E-328 Programs support (AMES)............	---	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
91-E-323 Building 90 seismic rehab., LBL....	3,678,000	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000
90-R-100 Trans. fac. replacement, ANL.......	1,377,000	2,378,000	2,378,000	2,378,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
90-R-121 Rehab fire, water, pumping and storage systems, ANL........................	994,000	533,000	533,000	533,000
90-R-107 Boiler replacement, BNL............	3,182,000	19,000	19,000	19,000
90-R-108 Ctrl. shops alteration & add., BNL.	1,366,000	8,000	8,000	8,000
90-R-109 Building addition, BNL.............	24,000	---	---	---
90-R-110 Instrumentation sup. lab. rehab, LB	---	1,903,000	1,903,000	1,903,000
90-R-111 Original labsite substation, LBL...	---	2,703,000	2,703,000	2,703,000
90-R-112 Measurements and controls support facility, ORNL............................	3,082,000	---	---	---
90-R-113 Elec. syst. upgrade, ORNL..........	1,449,000	8,000	8,000	8,000
90-R-117 Slope/seismic stabilization, LBL...	2,401,000	806,000	806,000	806,000
90-R-118 Fire protection upgrade, ORNL......	1,967,000	12,000	12,000	12,000
89-R-102 Fire protection III, BNL...........	33,000	---	---	---
89-R-108 Roads and parking rehab., ORNL.....	12,000	---	---	---
89-R-112 Replace PCB transformers, ANL......	7,000	---	---	---
88-R-805 Environmental improvements, BNL....	18,000	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
88-R-806 Environmental health & safety project, LBL	1,565,000	9,000	9,000	9,000
88-R-807 Electrical system rehab, ANL	893,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
87-R-753 Rehabilition laboratory space (building 200), ANL	1,528,000	9,000	9,000	9,000
87-R-756 Waterline replacement, ANL	8,000	---	---	---
84-ER-103 Road repair (various locations)	6,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Multiprogram general purpose facilities	23,590,000	23,891,000	23,891,000	23,891,000
TOTAL, SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS	789,847,000	801,658,000	804,158,000	851,158,000
(Operating expenses)	(627,019,000)	(632,783,000)	(635,283,000)	(682,283,000)
(Capital equipment)	(36,804,000)	(37,000,000)	(37,000,000)	(37,000,000)
(Construction)	(126,024,000)	(131,875,000)	(131,875,000)	(131,875,000)
POLICY AND MANAGEMENT				
I. Policy and management				
A. Policy and management - ER	845,000	1,150,000	1,150,000	1,150,000
B. Policy and management - NE	32,729,000	33,843,000	33,843,000	33,843,000
C. Policy and management - CE	1,647,000	1,905,000	1,905,000	1,905,000
TOTAL, POLICY AND MANAGEMENT	35,221,000	36,898,000	36,898,000	36,898,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
ENERGY APPLICATIONS				
I. Technical information management program				
Operating expenses	14,018,000	14,100,000	14,100,000	14,100,000
Capital equipment	895,000	900,000	900,000	900,000
Subtotal, Technical information management program	14,913,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
II. In-house energy management				
Operating expenses	3,519,000	3,540,000	3,540,000	3,540,000
Construction:				
90-A-601 Modifications for energy mgmt	16,901,000	17,110,000	17,110,000	17,110,000
Subtotal, In-house energy management	20,420,000	20,650,000	20,650,000	20,650,000
III. Strategic facilities utilization program				
Operating expenses	2,983,000	---	---	---
TOTAL, ENERGY APPLICATIONS	38,316,000	35,650,000	35,650,000	35,650,000
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT (NON-DEFENSE)				
I. Corrective activities				
A. Nuclear energy				
Operating expenses	804,000	271,000	271,000	271,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Construction:				
GP-E-600 General plant projects..............	439,000	283,000	283,000	283,000
91-E-203 SCTI waste water disposal system.....	2,844,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction.........................	3,283,000	283,000	283,000	283,000
Subtotal, Nuclear energy..........................	4,087,000	554,000	554,000	554,000
B. Energy research				
Operating expenses.............................	2,740,000	1,964,000	1,964,000	1,964,000
Capital equipment..............................	---	1,810,000	1,810,000	1,810,000
Construction:				
GP-E-600 General plant projects..............	2,979,000	7,368,000	7,368,000	7,368,000
92-E-601 Melton Valley LLLW collection and transfer system upgrade, ORNL.................	---	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
92-E-602 Air exhaust mods., TA-53 LANL........	---	3,505,000	3,505,000	3,505,000
91-E-307 800 Area landfill leachate (ANL).....	249,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
91-E-304 Sanit. wastewater treatment upgrade..	398,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
90-R-115 Laboratory and sanitary sewer collection system rehab (ANL).................	895,000	832,000	832,000	832,000
90-R-116 Hazardous waste mgmt proj (BNL)......	2,004,000	238,000	238,000	238,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
90-R-119 Sanitary wastewater treatment plant improvements (ANL)	2,962,000	3,185,000	3,185,000	3,185,000
88-R-830 Liquid low level waste collection and transfer sys upgrade (ORNL)	7,081,000	979,000	979,000	979,000
Subtotal, Construction	16,568,000	25,507,000	25,507,000	25,507,000
Subtotal, Energy research	19,308,000	29,281,000	29,281,000	29,281,000
Subtotal, Corrective activities	23,395,000	29,835,000	29,835,000	29,835,000
(Operating expenses)	(3,544,000)	(2,235,000)	(2,235,000)	(2,235,000)
(Capital equipment)	---	(1,810,000)	(1,810,000)	(1,810,000)
(Construction)	(19,851,000)	(25,790,000)	(25,790,000)	(25,790,000)
II. Environmental restoration				
Operating expenses:				
1. Facilities and sites	55,253,000	133,292,000	133,292,000	133,292,000
2. Formerly utilized sites, remedial action projects	29,200,000	49,000,000	49,000,000	49,000,000
3. Uranium program mill tailings, remedial action projects	119,000,000	139,900,000	139,900,000	139,900,000
4. Uranium mill tailings, groundwater restoration project	990,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Subtotal, Operating expenses	204,443,000	324,192,000	324,192,000	324,192,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Construction:				
90-R-402 Storage of the ANL CP-5 reactor........	4,374,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
89-R-113 Environmental upgrades, BNL............	2,983,000	1,901,000	1,901,000	1,901,000
	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------
Subtotal, Construction...........................	7,357,000	1,941,000	1,941,000	1,941,000
	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------
Subtotal, Environmental restoration..................	211,800,000	326,133,000	326,133,000	326,133,000
(Operating expenses).................................	(204,443,000)	(324,192,000)	(324,192,000)	(324,192,000)
(Construction).................................	(7,357,000)	(1,941,000)	(1,941,000)	(1,941,000)
III. Waste management				
Operating expenses:				
1. Waste operations............................	102,747,000	41,688,000	119,106,000	119,106,000
2. West valley.................................	79,072,000	104,000,000	104,000,000	104,000,000
3. Low level waste.............................	7,245,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------
Subtotal, Operating expenses......................	189,064,000	154,188,000	231,606,000	231,606,000
Capital equipment................................	781,000	965,000	965,000	965,000
Construction:				
GP-E-600 General plant projects................	3,191,000	4,712,000	4,712,000	4,712,000
91-E-322 Building compliance..................	1,611,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
91-E-305 Waste minimization fac. upgrade, BNL..	447,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
91-E-306 Haz waste treatment fac, PNL	868,000	3,030,000	3,030,000	3,030,000
89-R-111 Building utilities, PNL	199,000	32,000	32,000	32,000
88-R-812 Hazardous waste handling, fac. LBL	---	---	1,582,000	1,582,000
Subtotal, Construction	6,316,000	12,374,000	13,956,000	13,956,000
Subtotal, Waste management	196,161,000	167,527,000	246,527,000	246,527,000
(Operating expenses)	(189,064,000)	(154,188,000)	(231,606,000)	(231,606,000)
(Capital equipment)	(781,000)	(965,000)	(965,000)	(965,000)
(Construction)	(6,316,000)	(12,374,000)	(13,956,000)	(13,956,000)
IV. Technology development				
Operating expenses	497,000	---	---	---
Construction:				
91-EM-100 Environmental and molecular science laboratory at Richland	5,170,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Technology development	5,667,000	---	---	---
TOTAL, ENVIRON RESTOR AND WASTE MGMT (NON-DEFENSE)	437,023,000	523,495,000	602,495,000	602,495,000
(Operating expenses)	(397,548,000)	(480,615,000)	(558,033,000)	(558,033,000)
(Capital equipment)	(781,000)	(2,775,000)	(2,775,000)	(2,775,000)

URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

GROSS APPROPRIATIONS

Appropriations, 1991	$1,340,018,000
Budget estimate, 1992	1,547,000,000
House allowance	1,337,600,000
Committee recommendation	1,367,600,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 1991	−$1,450,400,000
Budget estimate, 1992	−1,547,000,000
House allowance	−1,547,000,000
Committee recommendation	−1,547,000,000

The appropriation recommended for uranium supply and enrichment activities provides for uranium enrichment production, uranium atomic vapor laser isotope separation [U-AVLIS] research and development, and related support activities. In this account, revenues received through the sale of enrichment services are used to offset costs incurred by the Department in providing these services. The total budget request for fiscal year 1992 is $1,547,000,000. Revenues are estimated in the budget request of $1,547,000,000 which are to be used to offset the requested fiscal year 1992 appropriation.

The budget proposed by the administration assumes the enactment of legislation to create a U.S. uranium enrichment corporation, a wholly owned Government corporation. The corporation would be responsible for maintaining a domestic source of enrichment services.

The proposed authorizing legislation has not been enacted. Therefore, the Committee has recommended an appropriation, offset by revenues, to the Department of Energy in the same manner as in previous years. The Committee reiterates its position that any proposal on the part of the Department to transfer any part or all of the enrichment enterprise to another entity for the purpose of providing enrichment services requires the prior enactment of enabling legislation.

Gaseous diffusion operations and support.—The Committee recommends the budget request for this activity, which is $1,036,895,000. The budget proposes the production of approximately 11.8 million separative work units [SWU] in fiscal year 1992.

Uranium atomic vapor laser isotope separation [U-AVLIS].—The budget request for this activity is $213,600,000, of which $204,300,000 is for operating expenses and $9,300,000 is for capital equipment and construction. The House allowance is $50,000,000 less than the request. The Committee recommendation restores $30,000,000 for the U-AVLIS program, providing $193,600,000.

The Committee is extremely concerned that the administration is not providing the necessary leadership to assure that the United States will benefit from the U-AVLIS technology. The U-AVLIS technology can provide this country with a low-cost, reliable domestic source of uranium enrichment services well into the next century. The United States has achieved a decisive 3- to 5-year lead over our foreign competitors in U-AVLIS technology and has invested more than $1,000,000,000 in developing the technology and preparing for deployment. The existing gaseous diffusion plants will become less economically competitive as they become increasingly more costly to operate due to increased requirements for environmental, safety, and health-related upgrades to achieve compliance with modern standards as well as increasing power costs. Prompt deployment of U-AVLIS can provide a U.S. competitive advantage and help the United States maintain an international leadership position.

The budget proposed by the administration assumes enactment of legislation to create a U.S. uranium enrichment corporation as an interim step to privatization of the uranium enrichment enterprise. When this corporation becomes fully operational, it would be able to make decisions for market introduction and deployment of U-AVLIS. However, delaying time urgent U-AVLIS predeployment activities while awaiting formation of the corporation, as the administration has proposed, will result in erosion or loss of the current U.S. technology lead and will undermine the U.S. international leadership position in the highly competitive enrichment market. Delay will also lead to cost growth. These effects will decrease the value of U-AVLIS technology in the marketplace and will substantially increase the difficulty of achieving the administration's goal of privatization of the enterprise. From the standpoint of U.S. industry, timely and successful deployment of U-AVLIS is the key to achieving a competitive advantage for the United States in a market which represents potentially tens of billions of dollars in sales over the life of a plant.

Successful deployment of U-AVLIS may require significant private sector investment. Private sector investment is possible only if qualified firms have access to the technology and market information with sufficient lead time to work with investors to develop sound investment plans. The greatest potential for achieving private investment will be realized by opening this opportunity to a wide spectrum of qualified firms.

In January 1990, the Department of Energy submitted to Congress a plan for the demonstration, transition, and deployment of the U-AVLIS technology. This plan described efforts that are needed to complete the demonstration of the U-AVLIS technology and also to prepare for design, construction, and operation of a large commercial plant. Only 1 year later, in presenting the fiscal year 1992 President's budget to Congress, the Department reversed its position on deployment-related activities and indicated that no funding was included in the fiscal year 1992 budget for deployment-related work.

The Committee continues to be concerned about the lack of direction and control of the AVLIS program and the apparent lack of an administration commitment to complete the technology demonstration. It is essential that the necessary steps be taken to assure successful commercial deployment of this important technology. Since 1989, the Committee has received testimony consistently maintaining that the AVLIS program is on the verge of deployment. Commercial deployment of AVLIS is required to ensure the Nation achieves the fullest benefit of its investment in the AVLIS technology.

Accordingly, the Committee directs that the Department rescope the demonstration program and continue efforts related to supporting AVLIS deployment in fiscal year 1992 and that $20,000,000 of the $193.6 million authorized in fiscal year 1992 for AVLIS be redirected to support predeployment activities. Specifically, the Department is directed to competitively select a single commercial deployment contractor, as per the Secretary's 1990 plan, to be on line by October 1, 1991, to direct the predeployment activities including: (1) Developing a transition plan for moving the program out of the laboratory; (2) confirming technical performance; (3) ensuring the demonstration program is focused to enhance the commercialization of the technology; (4) validating economic projections; (5) completing commercialization feasibility and risk studies; (6) initiating preliminary plant engineering; and (7) supporting the NRC licensing and EIS compliance activities. The Committee also believes that because of the importance to the overall fuel cycle, $15,000,000 should be allocated for uranium processing activities. This funding level is necessary to ensure the successful integration of AVLIS technology into the commercial nuclear fuel cycle.

While the Committee recognizes the importance of minimizing expenditures wherever possible in energy research and deployment activities, it is crucial that the AVLIS program proceed in a timely fashion if it is to have any chance for commercial success. The U.S. investment in AVLIS has been substantial, and laboratory progress has been excellent in the development of the technology. It is imperative that the transition from the laboratory environment to commercial application be begun as soon as possible and pursued vigorously in order to obtain maximum benefits from this important technology for enriching uranium at minimum cost to the taxpayers and the uranium enrichment customers.

Failure to implement these activities immediately will greatly increase the risk that the United States will lose the international lead position in uranium enrichment and will undermine the entire uranium enrichment enterprise, damaging the energy security and national security of this Nation.

Revenues.—In the Fiscal Year 1987 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, Congress reserved to itself the authority to determine the level of any unrecouped costs that must be returned to the Treasury in future legislation. To date, the Congress has not made such a determination. Accordingly, the recommended appropriation does not approve debt repayment and employs appropriation language which applies estimated fiscal year 1992 revenues to offset the recommended appropriations. Any revenues collected in fiscal year 1992 in excess of the amount needed to fully offset appropriations shall remain in the "Uranium enrichment" account until transferred or otherwise redirected in legislation.

The administration has proposed legislation in the appropriation language that would allow the Department of Energy to purchase enrichment services at prices below the Department's cost of production. The Committee recommendation does not include the proposed legislation and urges that these provisions be considered during the deliberation on the proposed legislation establishing a U.S. uranium enrichment corporation.

The following table shows the Committee's recommendation by program.

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 1991	$1,148,732,000
Budget estimate, 1992	1,548,939,000
House allowance	1,405,489,000
Committee recommendation	1,507,489,000

The general science programs are concerned with basic research to discover and understand the fundamental constituents of matter and energy and the basic forces in nature. Understanding of the laws of nature and the basic components from which matter and energy in all their varied forms are composed, forms the foundation upon which all of modern science and technology rests. Deeper understanding correspondingly contributes, sometimes in spectacular ways, to all of the scientific disciplines and to our Nation's technological base.

The general science program is organized into interrelated scientific programs, high-energy physics, and nuclear physics. While these programs are not directly associated with energy technology in the near term or midterm, they support basic research whose aim is to provide new knowledge which is expected to have long-term scientific and technological impacts on energy development and utilization and on other aspects of our society.

The Committee recommends $1,507,489,000 for general science and research activities, which is $102,000,000 more than the House allowance and $41,500,000 less than the budget request.

High-energy physics.—The Committee recommends $637,999,000 for high-energy physics.

The Committee recommendation provides $25,000,000 for the Fermilab main injector. This is an increase of $15,000,000 more than the House allowance and will continue the modernization of the Fermilab particle collider. The main injector together with other upgrades will help to ensure that Fermilab continues as one of the leading centers of high-energy physics and will maintain the vitality of research at the laboratory.

Nuclear physics.—The recommendation includes $354,390,000 for nuclear physics activities.

The full budget request of $49,350,000 for continued construction of the relativistic heavy ion collider [RHIC] is approved.

The Committee concurs with language included in the House report directing the Department to maintain the operation of each of the three heavy-ion accelerators at the national laboratories (Atlas at Argonne National Laboratory, the 88-inch cyclotron at the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, and the Holified at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory) with funds allocated in the nuclear physics budget.

For the Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility [CEBAF] in Newport News, VA, the Committee recommends $41,800,000 for fiscal year 1992. Continuing to stretch out construction of this project is not in the interest of the taxpayers nor the nuclear physics program.

The CEBAF will have unique capabilities to provide continuous beams of electrons simultaneously to three independent experimental areas. The initial research proposals have been developed by the national user community and selected after review by the

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(Construction)................................	(38,694,000)	(40,105,000)	(41,687,000)	(41,687,000)
Subtotal, Energy supply research and development......	2,581,794,000	2,821,428,000	2,854,053,000	2,940,916,000
Adjustments:				
Use of prior year balances...........................	-4,712,000	---	---	---
Education programs.....................................	-50,000,000	---	---	---
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.........	2,527,082,000	2,821,428,000	2,854,053,000	2,940,916,000
(Operating expenses)..................................	(2,215,952,000)	(2,508,115,000)	(2,542,158,000)	(2,626,021,000)
(Capital equipment).................................	(79,699,000)	(92,858,000)	(89,858,000)	(92,858,000)
(Construction)................................	(231,431,000)	(220,455,000)	(222,037,000)	(222,037,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
URANIUM ENRICHMENT				
Uranium enrichment activities:				
Gaseous diffusion operations and support:				
Operating expenses	$1,029,200,000	$974,456,000	$974,456,000	$974,456,000
Capital equipment	7,800,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Construction:				
92-U-200 sanitary water system upgrading		1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
91-U-200 replace capacitors, GDP, Paducah	4,000,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
91-U-201 refurbish int. purge fac., GDP, ports	1,400,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
91-U-207 roof upgrading, GDP, Portsmouth	3,800,000	8,340,000	8,340,000	8,340,000
91-U-208 S&S upgrading, GDP, Portsmouth	3,500,000	8,700,000	8,700,000	8,700,000
90-N-501 cooling tower mods	8,700,000	6,600,000	6,600,000	6,600,000
GP-N-501 GPP	8,800,000	10,499,000	10,499,000	10,499,000
89-N-501 UF6 cylinders	10,100,000	7,600,000	7,600,000	7,600,000
88-N-502 process inventory control system, pad	6,300,000			
87-N-502 coding tower upgrade, GDP, Paducah	2,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
82-N-413 improved UF6 containment	4,000,000			
Subtotal, construction	52,600,000	52,439,000	52,439,000	52,439,000
Subtotal, gaseous diffusion operations and support	1,089,600,000	1,036,895,000	1,036,895,000	1,036,895,000
Atomic vapor laser isotope separation				
Operating expenses	146,500,000	204,300,000	154,300,000	184,300,000
Capital equipment	5,600,000	6,100,000	6,100,000	6,100,000
Construction: GP-N-600 general plant projects	2,400,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
Subtotal, atomic vapor laser isotope separation	154,500,000	213,600,000	163,600,000	193,600,000
Alternate applications: Operating expenses		1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Corrective activities:				
Operating expenses	3,750,000	2,265,000	2,265,000	2,265,000
Construction:				
91-U-206 reduction of PCB contamination	5,500,000	16,519,000	16,519,000	16,519,000

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
GP-N-205 general plant projects		2,350,000	2,350,000	2,350,000
Subtotal, construction	5,500,000	18,869,000	18,869,000	18,869,000
Subtotal, corrective activities	9,250,000	21,134,000	21,134,000	21,134,000
Environmental restoration: Operating expenses	67,419,000	73,068,000	73,068,000	73,068,000
Waste management:				
Operating expenses	10,304,000	27,587,000	27,587,000	27,587,000
Capital equipment	2,945,000	1,260,000	1,260,000	1,260,000
Construction: GP-N-210 general plant projects	700,000	856,000	856,000	856,000
Subtotal, waste management	13,949,000	29,703,000	29,703,000	29,703,000
Program direction—OE	5,300,000	12,200,000	12,200,000	12,200,000
Working capital		159,400,000		
Subtotal, uranium enrichment activities	1,340,018,000	1,547,000,000	1,337,600,000	1,367,600,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,262,473,000)	(1,454,276,000)	(1,244,876,000)	(1,274,876,000)
(Capital equipment)	16,345,000)	(17,360,000)	(17,360,000)	(17,360,000)
(Construction)	(61,200,000)	(75,364,000)	(75,364,000)	(75,364,000)
Revenues	−1,450,400,000	−1,547,000,000	−1,547,000,000	−1,547,000,000
Total, uranium enrichment activities	−110,382,000		−209,400,000	−179,400,000
(Operating expenses)	(−187,927,000)	(−92,724,000)	(−302,124,000)	(−272,124,000)
(Capital equipment)	(16,345,000	(17,360,000)	(17,360,000)	(17,360,000)
(Construction)	(61,200,000)	(75,364,000)	(75,364,000)	(75,364,000)

CEBAF Program Advisory Committee. The plan for the basic experimental equipment required to accomplish CEBAF's research programs has been reviewed and endorsed by the Department of Energy and the Nuclear Science Advisory Committee.

It is the Committee's understanding that it is the Department of Energy's objective to bring the basic complement of experimental equipment for CEBAF's three experimental areas into operation during 1994 and 1995.

The CEBAF project construction is nearing completion. The project is currently within cost and on schedule with 60 percent of the work completed and 75 percent of the costs committed. Funding reductions under DOE's guidance in fiscal year 1992 will cause schedule delays of over 1 year and will cause an increase to the total project cost. Accordingly, the Committee has provided additional funding to help alleviate these impacts. An additional $2,000,000 in equipment funds will also help to enable CEBAF to start operations for physics in fiscal year 1994. The Committee agrees that no one wins when funds needed for constructing, commissioning, and operating new facilities are underestimated and significant schedule delays and cost increases result. Budgetary constraints do not allow all the funds that have been identified as necessary to deliver CEBAF to the Nation's scientific community on schedule and within cost. Nevertheless, the Committee is impressed with the accomplishment of the CEBAF leadership and employees to date. CEBAF's director and staff are to be highly commended for their efforts and the Committee provides these additional funds in order to help maintain the impressive work in bringing this project toward completion. The Department is urged to work closely with CEBAF to define the appropriate level of funding required to complete construction on schedule.

Superconducting Super Collider.—The Committee recommends $508,700,000 for the Superconducting Super Collider [SSC], $25,000,000 less than the budget request, for this high-priority national project.

This increased appropriation is recognition by the Committee of the importance of the Super Collider to science and our Nation. The SSC holds great potential for exploring the structure of matter and stimulating new technology.

The SSC will advance knowledge and technology that will benefit our Nation's educational and scientific communities and help keep American industry competitive in key commercial areas. The experience U.S. industry will gain in providing the SSC magnets will assist in expanding the commercial use of superconducting magnets in such areas as magnetic levitation, efficient electrical energy generation and storage, and lifesaving medical diagnostics using magnetic resonance imaging and related technology. Superconductivity has been determined by the Departments of Commerce and Defense as being critical, generic technology for the Nation.

There has been substantial progress on the SSC during fiscal year 1991. One of the most important accomplishments was the development of the Department of Energy's baseline cost and schedule estimate for the SSC. This baseline establishes a total project cost at $8,249,000,000, with project completion by the end of fiscal year 1999. The baseline cost includes a contingency allowance sufficient for the SSC laboratory to respond to technical and schedule uncertainties that might arise and the extension of the project completion date by 1 year.

The management of the SSC also has been substantially strengthened with the appointments of a SSC laboratory general manager and project manager and an onsite DOE project director. An experienced management team and strict control procedures are now in place to ensure that the SSC is built to the cost and schedule baseline.

Other major accomplishments include the award of a major contract for architect-engineering/construction management services, completion of the supplemental environmental impact statement and record of decision for construction and operation of the SSC, completion of a memorandum of understanding with the State of Texas that outlines the principles that will govern the State's participation and financial contribution to the project, the beginning of land acquisition by the State of Texas and the transfer of those lands to the Federal Government, the initiation of onsite construction of the magnet development laboratory, the selection of contractors for the engineering development, prototype production, and production of collider dipole magnets, and the successful testing of four models of the 50-millimeter design dipole magnets.

The State of Texas is currently ahead of schedule in acquiring and delivering the 16,000 acres of land necessary to build the campus areas and construct the 54-mile tunnel. In accordance with its agreement with the SSC laboratory and the Department of Energy, the State of Texas recently awarded grants to universities around the Nation to conduct the research necessary before the project is operational in 1999.

The Committee is advised that the reduction proposed by the House would delay the project by over one-half of a year and add approximately $210,000,000 to the total cost of the project. Over 88 universities in 31 States could be affected by the reduction. The Committee has restored all but $25,000,000 in the recommended bill.

In action on last year's appropriation bill, the Committee recommended certain provisions and stated its views on foreign participation and involvement with the SSC project. Again, in recognition of the international character of high energy physics research and the fact that the Superconducting Super Collider will be used by scientists from many nations, the Secretary of Energy is encouraged to continue with efforts seeking significant foreign investment in the construction of the project. However, it continues to be the consensus of the Committee that construction of the SSC should not be dependent on the question of whether foreign participation will be forthcoming. Simply stated, if the SSC is a high-priority project and important for this Nation, which the Committee believes it is, then we should be prepared to proceed. The Committee restates its belief that the benefits to be gained by magnet industrialization, especially manufacturing technology in the U.S. industry outweigh the budgetary requirements that are asserted as necessary to require foreign participation. Additionally, the funds made available under this appropriation act to the Department of Energy for the project shall be used to assure that U.S. industrial participants and contractors are given the maximum opportunity to participate in the SSC project in order that U.S. industry receives benefits commensurate with the U.S. investment from the new technologies developed for the project, especially magnet manufacturing technologies.

It is the Committee's intent that the Secretary of Energy comply with all existing laws to ensure that the Federal funding for the development, construction, and operation of the SSC be made available to the extent practicable to business concerns or other organizations owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals (within the meaning of section 8(a) (5) and (6)), including historically black colleges and universities and minority educational institutions.

The following tabulation shows the Committee recommendation for each program and activity:

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

Appropriations, 1991	$242,833,001
Budget estimate, 1992	305,071,000
House allowance	305,071,000
Committee recommendation	295,071,000

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 and the Nuclear Waste Policy Act Amendments of 1987 provide for the development, construction, and operation of a repository for the disposal of high-level nuclear waste and spent fuel. The law also establishes the nuclear waste disposal fund to finance these activities through the collection of fees from the owners and generators of the waste. In fiscal year 1992, the fund will generate revenues of $809,100,000 derived from fees and interest income.

The goal of the nuclear waste disposal fund program is to construct, license, and operate a waste management system for the disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste from commercial and atomic energy defense activities in a manner that is safe and environmentally acceptable and in conformance with the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 and the Nuclear Waste Policy Act Amendments of 1987. Yucca Mountain, NV, has been designated as the site for detailed site characterization activities. If the Nevada site is found suitable after completion of site characterization, the site will be recommended for development as a repository and a license application will be submitted to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Upon completion of the Commission's review of the license application, if the Commission finds reasonable assurance that the public health and safety will be protected, the Department of Energy would be authorized to construct a repository at the Yucca Mountain site.

The overall budget request for this activity is $305,071,000 including $32,225,000 for analysis of a monitored retrievable storage site. The Committee recommendation is for $295,071,000, a reduction of $10,000,000 due to current delays, slippage, and budgetary constraints.

The Committee is aware of the Secretary of Energy's efforts to restructure and streamline the nuclear waste program, to eliminate duplicative or unnecessary contractual arrangements, and to obtain access to Yucca Mountain to carry out site characterization activities. The Committee supports these efforts. The Committee remains concerned, however, that in spite of these efforts the Department has been unable to initiate new site characterization activities at the Yucca Mountain site because of its inability to obtain the necessary environmental permits from the State of Nevada through the course of the normal permitting process.

The Committee believes it is critical that the Department initiate new site activities at Yucca Mountain at the earliest possible date and supports all of the Department's efforts to accomplish this goal. The Committee regrets that the Department has not been able to reach some agreement with the State of Nevada that would allow the Department's site testing program to move forward. The Committee notes that the Department has recently resubmitted its permit applications to the State of Nevada, at the request of the State and as a result of court order. The Committee hopes that the

State will now act in good faith to process these permit applications on a reasonable time schedule that will allow detailed site testing at Yucca Mountain to begin. The Committee believes very strongly that it is only through conduct of the detailed site characterization and testing program that the Yucca Mountain site will ultimately be proven either suitable or unsuitable for development as a repository.

Until such time as the Department is able to obtain access to the Yucca Mountain site, the Committee believes that it is appropriate to continue to limit the funding provided for oversight of the nuclear waste program by the State and local governments. Therefore, the Committee has provided not more than $5,000,000 to the State of Nevada for the conduct of its oversight responsibilities pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended, and not more than $5,000,000 to affected local governments for appropriate activities pursuant to the act. These amounts provided to the State and local governments represent essentially the same amounts as provided in fiscal year 1991.

The Committee recommendation includes the requested change in the appropriations language from grant authority to direct payment that the Department believes would aid in improving the contentious relationship that currently exists between the State of Nevada and the Department of Energy. The administration has advised that the language would also serve to reduce the administrative burden on both the Department and the recipients of the grants. The Committee has been advised that the modification of the appropriation language is favored by both the Department and the recipient of the grants.

The following additional recommendations and guidance in the administration and distribution of funds from the neclear waste disposal fund have been approved by the Committee:

State oversight.—As first indicated in the fiscal year 1989 conference committee report, it is the intent of Congress that neither the State of Nevada, or any volunteer State or Indian tribe, is to conduct its own site characterization program. Any such financial assistance provided by the Department of Energy pursuant to the provisions of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, as amended, is to be used solely for the purpose of oversight of the Department of Energy's site characterization program. It continues to be the intent of Congress that any activity conducted by the State of Nevada, or any volunteer State or Indian tribe, is not to duplicate or unreasonably interfere with data collection or site characterization activities conducted by the Department of Energy.

Prohibitions regarding coalition building and lobbying.—The Committee reiterates its intent that financial assistance provided to the State of Nevada shall not be used to support, in any way, either directly or indirectly, multistate efforts or to engage in coalition building activities with respect to the transportation of nuclear waste to a potential repository in Nevada. Further, any financial assistance provided shall not be used to support, directly or indirectly, lobbying activities with respect to activities associated with the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, as amended, subject to the same prohibitions of 18 U.S.C. 1913. The Committee supports fully and directs the Department to recover, in their entirety, any such funds provided to the State of Nevada that were improperly used to support lobbying activities with respect to the Yucca Mountain project.

Prohibition regarding litigation.—The Committee takes note of the extensive nature of litigation initiated by the State of Nevada against the Department of Energy with respect to the Yucca Mountain project. It is the Committee's intent that no costs incurred by the State of Nevada for litigation against the Department of Energy with respect to the Yucca Mountain project may be paid for by funds provided through the annual financial assistance granted to the State. The Committee directs the Department of Energy to recover, in their entirety, any such funds expended for the purpose of litigation against the Department of Energy with respect to the Yucca Mountain project.

Expenditure of grant moneys within Nevada.—It also continues to be the intent of the Committee that any such financial assistance provided to the State of Nevada and affected counties should, to the maximum extent practicable, be spent within the State of Nevada. In the case of Inyo County, CA, this direction does not apply.

Provision of State information to DOE.—It is the express intent of the Committee that any data, reports, including draft reports, or other information, developed by the State of Nevada, using funds provided to the State through the financial assistance provisions of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, as amended, shall be made available expeditiously, to the Department of Energy, at their request, in order to assist in the evaluation of the Yucca Mountain site.

Restrictions related to PETT.—The Department will soon publish (has published) its final rule with respect to making payments equal to taxes. It is the Committee's direction that of the $295,071,000 appropriated for the Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Program, an amount not to exceed $4,000,000 may be expended in partial satisfaction of the payment the Department of Energy is obligated to make to the affected jurisdictions, including the State of Washington and affected counties within the State of Washington.

ISOTOPE PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION FUND

Appropriations, 1991	....
Budget estimate, 1992	$8,500,000
House allowance	8,500,000
Committee recommendation	8,500,000

The Department, through the Isotope Production and Distribution Program, provides radioactive and stable isotope products and associated services to a wide and varied domestic and international market. These materials and services are produced, processed, and provided through the utilization of DOE facilities and scientific capabilities which exist to satisfy other DOE research and production missions. Ultimate applications of isotope products include medical research and health care, industrial research and manufacturing, agriculture, food preservation, education, and national defense. Prices for the products are established to recover program costs while revenues realized from the sales are retained by the program as an offset to costs and investments in processes, improvements, unique equipment, and isotope research.

The fiscal year 1990 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, Public Law 101-101, authorized a separate "Isotope production and distribution" account with an initial capitalization of $16,100,000 and the ability to retain revenues. No funds were requested for the IP&D Program in fiscal year 1991, however, the fiscal year 1991 program clarifies the ability of the IP&D Program to return revenues for future use to offset programmatic needs. The fiscal year 1992 budget requests borrowing authority of $8,500,000 for the costs associated with new product initiatives, which include isotopes of molybdenum for medical application, and krypton and zinc which have industrial applications.

In keeping with Government policies and practices, prices are set for products offered under this program in a manner that will not discourage the use of the products nor the development of domestic sources of supply independent of DOE.

The appropriation language will allow retention of revenues received for use in funding isotope production, sale, and distribution activities of the Department.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 1991	$11,537,014,000
Budget estimate, 1992	11,768,000,000
House allowance	11,768,500,000
Committee recommendation	11,968,000,000

The Committee recommends a total appropriation of $11,968,000,000 for atomic energy defense activities.

The appropriation recommended for atomic energy defense activities supports the research, development, testing, production and stockpile maintenance for nuclear weapons, inertial confinement fusion, naval reactors development, verification and control technology, special materials production, defense environmental restoration and waste management, and nuclear materials security and safeguards.

In order to provide better financial control and more clearly display the activities funded as part of atomic energy defense activities, the Committee recommendation provides seven appropriation accounts instead of a single account as in past years. The new accounts are: Research, Development, and Testing; Production and Surveillance; Materials Production; New Production Reactor; Naval Reactors; Environmental Restoration and Waste Management; and Other Defense Programs.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND TESTING

The recommendation for research, development, and testing activities totals $1,976,650,000.

This program provides for the research, development, engineering, testing, and production of all U.S. nuclear weapons; maintenance of reliable weapons for their stockpile life; and retirement and disposal of nuclear weapons from the stockpile. The fiscal year 1992 recommendation will continue efforts to provide new technology to maintain a modern nuclear force, along with the design and development of new weapons systems in response to defense requirements.

Research and development.—The Committee recommends $1,255,958,000 for research and development activities.

The Committee has included $521,950,000, an increase of $132,000,000 over the budget request, for core research and development technology base activities. The additional funding has been recommended in order to maintain a strong science and technology capability within DOE's national laboratories, and to reverse declining resource levels for core research, technology programs and staffing, and to link DOE national laboratories closer to the industrial sector. The current funding level for these core technical programs is substantially below the fiscal year 1990 level and if this decline is allowed to continue, it could seriously impact nuclear weapons safety as outlined by the Drell Panel, arms control and verification activities, and the restoration and cleanup of the weapons complex.

The Committee believes that if DOE is to continue to be the preeminent Federal technology agency, it must consider new opportunities for strengthening its support of generic, precompetitive technology research deemed critical to future U.S. economic competitiveness. To accomplish this, a closer assocation through cooperative agreements with the private sector is essential. The Department is urged to strengthen its capabilities in key areas of materials science, manufacturing, computing, and waste remediation.

The Committee approves $50,000,000 for technology commercialization to carry out the goals of the National Competitiveness Technology Transfer Act of 1989 (Public Law 101-189) as currently being implemented by DOE. The Committee continues to strongly support the Department of Energy's activities pursuing new innovative technology commercialization ventures and believes they will greatly enhance U.S. competitiveness by drawing on the significant investment in the Department's high technology defense capabilities through cooperative arrangements with the U.S. private sector. The Committee urges the Department to proceed to attract companies into partnerships which enhance national critical technologies and expects that cooperative research and development agreements [CRADA] will form the basis for these partnerships and the technology transfer activities.

To support this augmented technology base program, the Committee has also recommended $107,950,000 for capital equipment, an increase of $20,000,000 over the House allowance and budget request.

The Committee has provided $34,100,000 for project 90-D-102, nuclear weapons research, development and testing facilities revitalization. The additional funds are required to initiate interim upgrades to the Chemical and Metallurgy Research Lab at Los Alamos National Laboratory to assure reliable continued operations in compliance with current environmental, safety, and health standards.

Inertial confinement fusion.—The Committee has included $194,800,000 in the bill for inertial confinement fusion research activities. This is the same as the House allowance. The Committee

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH				
High energy physics:				
Physics research: Operating expenses	$137,020,000	$150,370,000	$150,370,000	$145,370,000
Facility operations:				
Operating expenses	260,370,000	275,690,000	275,690,000	270,690,000
Capital equipment	78,740,000	83,250,000	83,250,000	83,250,000
Construction:				
92–G–302 Fermilab main injector		43,450,000		25,000,000
92–G–304 accelerator improvements and mods		15,805,000	15,805,000	15,805,000
91–G–304 AIP	14,535,000			
90–R–104 Fermilab linac upgrade project	12,000,000	6,166,000	6,166,000	6,166,000
GP–E–103 general plant projects, various locations	12,317,000	13,398,000	13,398,000	13,398,000
Subtotal, construction	38,852,000	78,819,000	35,369,000	60,369,000
Subtotal, facility operations	377,962,000	437,759,000	394,309,000	414,309,000
High energy technology: Operating expenses	69,355,000	78,830,000	78,830,000	78,830,000
Other capital equipment	4,250,000	4,490,000	4,490,000	4,490,000
Subtotal, high energy physics	588,587,000	666,449,000	622,999,000	637,999,000
(Operating expenses)	(466,745,000)	(499,890,000)	(499,890,000)	(489,890,000)
(Capital equipment)	(82,990,000)	(87,740,000)	(87,740,000)	(87,740,000)
(Construction)	(38,852,000)	(78,819,000)	(35,369,000)	(60,369,000)
Nuclear physics:				
Medium energy physics: Operating expenses	98,200,000	108,100,000	108,100,000	108,100,000
Heavy ion physics: Operating expenses	70,929,000	74,700,000	74,700,000	74,700,000
Low energy physics: Operating expenses	27,300,000	28,391,000	28,391,000	28,391,000
Nuclear theory: Operating expenses	13,100,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000
Capital equipment	22,585,000	26,300,000	26,300,000	28300,000
Construction:				
92–G–301 AIP		4,100,000	4,100,000	4,100,000
91–G–300 relativistic heavy ion collider	13,500,000	49,350,000	49,350,000	49,350,000
91–G–301 AIP	3,780,000			
GP–E–300 general plant projects, various locations	3,920,000	3,949,000	3,949,000	3,949,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
87–R–203 continuous electron beam accelerator facility, Newport News, VA	58,500,000	31,800,000	31,800,000	41,800,000
Subtotal, construction	79,700,000	89,199,000	89,199,000	99,199,000
Other capital equipment—CE	1,515,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
Subtotal, nuclear physics	313,329,000	342,390,000	342,390,000	354,390,000
(Operating expenses)	(209,529,000)	(225,191,000)	(225,191,000)	(225,191,000)
(Capital equipment)	(24,100,000)	(28,000,000)	(28,000,000)	(30,000,000)
(Construction)	(79,700,000)	(89,199,000)	(89,199,000)	(99,199,000)
General science program direction—OE	3,950,000	6,400,000	6,400,000	6,400,000
Superconducting super collider:				
Operating expenses	116,000,000	103,593,000	103,593,000	103,593,000
Capital equipment	33,000,000	56,340,000	56,340,000	56,340,000
Construction: 90–R–106 superconducting super collider	93,866,000	373,767,000	273,767,000	348,767,000
Subtotal, superconducting super collider	242,866,000	533,700,000	433,700,000	508,700,000
Total, general science and research	1,148,732,000	1,548,939,000	1,405,489,000	1,507,489,000
(Operating expenses)	(796,224,000)	(835,074,000)	(835,074,000)	(825,074,000)
(Capital equipment)	(140,090,000)	(172,080,000)	(172,080,000)	(174,080,000)
(Construction)	(212,418,000)	(541,785,000)	(398,335,000)	(508,335,000)

recommendation includes $20,300,000 for upgrade of the OMEGA laser.

Testing.—The Committee recommendation for testing activities totals $507,050,000 which is $17,700,000 over the budget request and House allowance. The additional funds are provided to support the technology and scientific base of DOE's RD&T programs which have been eroding and to ensure the safety of the Nation's nuclear stockpile.

The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for the Marshall Islands radiological activities including: logistical support, the medical program, environmental studies, and equipment and technical support. In anticipation of resettlement of Rongelap, the Committee expects the Department to refocus its efforts toward Rongelap as appropriate, while maintaining its overall effort to verify that the people of all affected islands will continue to be safe from the effects of previous U.S. weapons testing. The Committee expects the Department to continue to cooperate and coordinate its activities with the Government of the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Nuclear Claims Tribunal, the Office of Territorial and International Affairs, and with the Marshallese communities affected. The Committee also expects the Department to provide for external review of the Department's scientific methodology and results. Finally, the Committee notes the expressions of concern from community representatives regarding the Department's intentions for the future of this program, and regarding the organizational relationship within the program. The Committee expects that any significant organizational relationship or program changes will be discussed with the Committee and with community representatives before implementation.

PRODUCTION AND SURVEILLANCE

The Committee recommendation for production and surveillance totals $2,590,478,000. The Committee concurs with the House action in not providing funding for the Nuclear Depth/Strike Bomb and the Short-Range Attack Missile-T [SRAM-T].

The recommendation for production and surveillance operating expenses totals $2,348,950,000. The Committee is concerned with the continued decline in resources available to address critical operating needs within the production complex. While portions of the complex are not operating or are being addressed in the Department's environmental restoration program, many facilities and processes remain functional and are in need of corrective maintenance or other work to meet State and Federal environmental, health, and safety standards. In addition, increased weapon retirements and other requirements not contemplated when the budget was formulated will severely strain manpower and facilities.

Therefore, the Committee recommends additional funds, along with the reallocation of funds from the ND/SB and SRAM-T, to address the 100-percent increase in weapons retirements over the level assumed in the President's 1992 budget, for site facility and equipment maintenance, for preproduction and process engineering connected with pit reuse, to reduce maintenance backlogs, particularly at the Y-12 plant, for new requirements related to the W-79, and for compliance requirements at Y-12.

The House report accompanying the bill places the requirement on the Department of Energy to establish a task force to evaluate the need to resume recovery and processing operations at the Rocky Flats plant and prohibits the obligation and expenditure of funds for resumption of operations. The Secretary of Energy has informed the Committee that an independent panel is not needed to confirm the Department's plans for Rocky Flats. Further, the responsibility for national security in the area of atomic energy defense activities, by law, is placed on the President and the Secretary of Energy. The Committee has also been informed by the Department that there are serious questions regarding the capability of other facilities to meet the national security requirements directed by the President.

MATERIALS PRODUCTION

The Committee recommendation for materials production totals $1,891,900,000, of which $1,479,312,000 is for operating expenses, and $412,588,000 is for plant and capital equipment. This is an increase of almost $15,000,000 over the budget request for fiscal year 1992.

The Materials Production Program provides nuclear materials to meet near-term national defense and nondefense requirements. In addition, materials production sustains a base production program capable of meeting long-term nuclear materials production requirements consistent with the annual Presidential nuclear weapons stockpile memorandum [NWSM] and the annual Department of Energy materials management plan.

The Materials Production Program operates a reactor feed material production complex, production reactors at Savannah River, spent fuel chemical processing plants at Savannah River site, SC, Richland, WA, and the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory in Idaho Falls, ID, and various other sites. These facilities are unique to the production of nuclear materials for defense purposes.

The Materials Production Program is organized into the following subcategories: Reactor operations, processing of nuclear materials, supporting services, capital equipment, and program direction.

Reactor operations.—The Committee recommendation for reactor operations is $584,418,000 which is the same as the budget request and House allowance.

Processing of nuclear materials.—The Committee recommendation for processing of nuclear materials totals $572,717,000, an increase of $15,000,000 over the budget request and House allowance.

The Committee is very concerned that no clear long-term strategy exists for future plutonium processing. Many of the existing facilities are obsolete and the technologies employed are not state of the art in terms of minimizing radiation exposure and waste.

Over the past decade, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory [LLNL] has assembled a major scientific and engineering capability in the area of plutonium processing as a key part of the laser isotope separation program. This cadre of highly skilled personnel has developed the expertise to design and integrate the specific technologies and items of equipment and to optimize processing systems where the operation of each critical item has been demonstrated by thorough testing. The design of a fully integrated plutonium processing facility for production operations that has an approved EIS and that minimizes waste, reduces radiation doses to workers, and meets or exceeds all modern standards of waste disposal is an exceptional accomplishment in today's environment. The integrated team which achieved this success is a unique resource to the Nation and the Department of Energy. It is important to maintain this successful team as well as the modern systems and facilities at LLNL in order that these highly specialized and scarce technical resources can be focused to support the national strategy which must be developed for plutonium processing in the DOE nuclear weapons complex.

As long as the U.S. nuclear deterrent utilizes plutonium, a processing capability will be required. However, the technologies in today's production complex are largely obsolete and in many cases are inconsistent with the goals of the Secretary of Energy for a modernized production complex. Over 10 years ago the special isotope separation [SIS] program initiated activities to respond to the need to systematically develop, engineer, and integrate processes and hardware to minimize waste generation and personnel radiation exposure, while simultaneously improving overall productivity. The multidisciplinary, project-oriented team assembled within LLNL during the past decade from a wide spectrum of diverse technical organizations is relatively unique in technical depth, breadth of perspective, and freedom from day-to-day production constraints. This highly integrated LLNL effort has, in fact, constituted the driving force behind many of the recent proposed technology improvements for the future. If dissolved, there will be critical loss of technology perspective to the DOE while it plans for future modernization.

Therefore, the Committee has provided $15,000,000 in fiscal year 1992 to preserve this capability vital to DOE while a national strategy is being devised.

Supporting services.—The Committee recommendation for supporting services totals $558,472,000 which is the same as the budget request and House allowance.

Enriched materials.—Enriched materials programs funded under materials production last year are funded in the Naval Reactors Development Program for fiscal year 1992.

Capital equipment and program management.—The Committee has provided $92,198,000 for capital equipment. This is the same as the budget request. The Committee recommendation for program direction is $43,244,000 which is also the same as the budget request.

NEW PRODUCTION REACTORS

An appropriation of $483,000,000 is recommended for new production reactors. This is $108,000,000 over the appropriation for the current year.

The New Production Reactors Program provides for the acquisition, including design and construction, of new production reactor capability to meet national security requirements. Activities include planning, development, and execution of program strategy and management and application of standards for safety, quality, environmental, and performance factors into the design and construction of new production reactor capability.

In recognition of changing defense requirements for nuclear materials, the fiscal year 1992 budget request provides funding to support the selection of only one reactor technology for construction. Following completion of the environmental impact statement in late 1991, a record of decision [ROD] will be published designating the final choice of a reactor and a site for detailed design and construction.

The Committee has provided $344,465,000, the full budget request, for the continued acquisition, design, and construction of the new production reactors to meet national security requirements.

The Committee recommendation for light water reactor target development is $8,000,000 to support completion of the EIS and ROD process associated with the New Production Reactor Program.

NAVAL REACTORS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $695,160,000 for naval reactors for fiscal year 1992.

The Naval Reactors Program provides for the design, development, testing, and evaluation of improved naval nuclear propulsion plants and reactor cores. The nuclear propulsion plants and cores cover a wide range of configurations and power ratings suitable for installation in naval combatants varying in size from small submarines to large surface ships.

The Committee recommendation includes $695,160,000 for the Naval Reactor Development Program. This is $17,000,000 over both the House allowance and budget request. The additional funding is required to cover higher than expected reactor operating costs in fiscal year 1992, deferred advanced development work, and core redesign/manufacturing modifications which the Committee understands could be initiated in fiscal year 1992.

Enriched materials.—The enriched materials request of $122,840,000 provides highly enriched uranium to manufacture fuel for cores used in naval powered ships. The Committee recommendation is the same as the House allowance and budget request.

The Committee understands that proposed cutbacks in the nuclear weapons inventory should free up significant amounts of highly enriched uranium and that the use of these materials for feed stock production reactors or naval fuel has the potential of providing substantial savings. The Committee is concerned with the amount of time that the Department of Energy and Department of Defense are taking to arrive at a decision on this matter. The Committee, therefore, strongly concurs with the House Committee and directs that the Committee on Appropriations of the House and Senate be advised at the earliest possible time, but not later than October 1, 1991, of what DOE intends to do in this regard.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT (DEFENSE)

An appropriation of $3,640,372,000 is recommended for environmental cleanup activities at the Department's defense facilities. The amount recommended is an increase of $595,650,000 over the appropriation for the current year.

This program encompasses four categories of activities: Corrective activities are necessary to bring DOE facilities into compliance with applicable local, State, and Federal regulations; waste management includes the treatment, storage, and disposal of radioactive, hazardous, mixed, or sanitary wastes generated as a result of ongoing operations at active facilities; environmental restoration includes the assessment and cleanup of surplus facilities and inactive sites; and technology development is an applied research and development initiative to support environmental restoration and waste management activities.

The Committee approves the Department's plans to support additional consortia for training the scientists, engineers, and technicians that will be needed for the Environmental Restoration Program in the future. The Committee encourages the Department to support consortia that include colleges and universities that serve underrepresented groups, as well as research universities from the mainstream. The Committee also encourages the concept of students having summer research experiences at DOE laboratories and sites having major environmental restoration programs.

The Committee understands that the State of Washington, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Department of Energy have agreed to certain revisions to the Hanford tri-party agreement and, therefore, has provided $43,900,000 for the Hanford Waste Vitrification Plant, including $42,200,000 for construction and $1,700,000 in operating expenses in support of the project.

The Committee recommendation includes $1,600,000 to continue downwinder studies, authorized by Public Law 101-510, in fiscal year 1992.

PUREX processing plant.—In the Senate report to the fiscal year 1991 Energy and Water Development appropriations bill, the Committee included language expressing its concern for the future of the PUREX plant at the Hanford Reservation. The Committee reaffirms that the Department shall complete an environmental impact statement prior to reopening the facility, as well as complete an independent safety review by the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, and a comprehensive assessment, with independent oversight, exploring all the available options, including those that would not require operation of PUREX or an oxidation facility.

It is the Committee's understanding that the initial work on a 3-year EIS has begun and directs the Department to proceed in accordance with its October 1990 announcement. The Department is directed to suspend all activities associated with development of new missions for the PUREX and other related facilities until the completion of an EIS and the issuance of a record of decision by the Secretary of Energy.

The Committee also is concerned with the proposed transfer of PUREX, Plutonium Finishing Plant, and the N-reactor to waste management. The Committee believes that the Department should justify clearly the transfer of any facility from one account to another prior to making the transfer.

Defense high-level waste disposal fee.—The Committee is aware that, in accordance with the Committee report accompanying the Senate amendments to H.R. 5019, making appropriations for energy and water development for fiscal year 1991, the Department's Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Program deposited $5,000,000 into the nuclear waste fund to demonstrate the Department's good faith and intentions regarding payment of its continuing obligation. The Committee also notes with dismay, however, that no funds have been requested for this purpose for fiscal year 1992. The Committee remains concerned that as of September 30, 1990, the estimated amount due the nuclear waste fund, including interest, to cover the costs of disposal of defense high-level waste in a repository has reached $573,370,000, of which $41,450,000 is for interest alone for fiscal year 1990. The Committee believes that this obligation should continue to be addressed on an annual basis even if only as a demonstration of good faith and intention. Therefore, the Committee directs that $15,000,000 of the funds provided herein be deposited in the nuclear waste fund for this purpose and urges the Department to include continuing funds for this purpose in all future annual budget requests.

Other Defense Programs

WASTE TRANSPORTATION AND SITE MANAGEMENT

The Waste Transportation and Site Management Program activities are funded in the Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Program for fiscal year 1992.

VERIFICATION AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY

The Verification and Control Technology Program consists of two subprograms, arms control and Office of Intelligence. Activities under arms control include detection technology, analytical support, and treaty implementation. Activities in the Office of Intelligence include analytical support, threat assessment, and counterintelligence.

Arms control.—The Committee recommends $185,000,000 for arms control activities for fiscal year 1992. This is the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

The Arms Control Program supports the development and execution of U.S. national security and foreign policy in the areas of treaty verification and arms control. The fiscal year 1992 program provides for development of verification technologies for special nuclear materials, treaty implementation activities for the Threshold Test Ban Treaty [TTBT] and the Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty [PNET] and increased technical and analytical support activities.

Intelligence.—The Office of Intelligence provides analyses over a broad range of issues and topics, nuclear and nonnuclear, in support of the Department's responsibilities and its participation in the formulation of national security policies and other Government facilities and activities.

The Committee concurs with the House in providing $45,000,000 for intelligence activities, an increase of $3,121,000 over the funding level for fiscal year 1991.

NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommends $96,000,000 for nuclear materials security and safeguards development, the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

This program includes activities to assure adequate protection of nuclear weapons, nuclear materials, facilities, and classified information against theft, sabotage, espionage, and terrorist activities. The program focuses on providing safeguards and technical support to United States and international activities designed to minimize the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS

Activities funded under this heading include those functions necessary for granting appropriate security clearances to agency and Government contractor personnel who must, in the performance of their work, have access to restricted data, national security information or special nuclear material, or who occupy a designated critical sensitive position.

The recommendation includes $62,600,000 for security investigations. This the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

SECURITY EVALUATIONS

An appropriation of $15,000,000 is recommended for security evaluations, which is the same as the budget request and House allowance.

The Security Evaluations Program provides oversight of the effectiveness of the Department of Energy's safeguards and security policies and programs by conducting inspections and assessments of these policies and programs, and reviewing their implementation in the field. The program also includes funds for the Radioactive Materials Packaging Certification Program which certifies that radioactive material packages are in compliance with Federal safety regulations.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Details of the Committee's recommendation, current year estimates, the budget request, and House allowance are shown in the following table:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES				
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES				
I. Research and development				
A. Research and development - weapons				
Operating expenses	884,318,000	882,300,000	882,300,000	1,032,300,000
Capital equipment	91,300,000	87,950,000	87,950,000	107,950,000
Construction:				
GP-D-101 General plant projects, various locations	20,000,000	21,400,000	21,400,000	21,400,000
92-D-102 Nuclear weapons research, development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase IV, various locations	---	6,600,000	6,600,000	6,600,000
90-D-102 Nuclear weapons research, development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase III, various locations	9,600,000	22,100,000	22,100,000	34,100,000
88-D-106 Nuclear weapons research, development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase II, various locations	72,547,000	53,608,000	53,608,000	53,608,000
Subtotal, Construction	102,147,000	103,708,000	103,708,000	115,708,000
Subtotal, Research and development - weapons	1,077,765,000	1,073,958,000	1,073,958,000	1,255,958,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
B. Inertial fusion				
Operating expenses	157,900,000	165,300,000	165,300,000	165,300,000
Capital equipment	17,100,000	17,200,000	29,500,000	29,500,000
Subtotal, Inertial fusion	175,000,000	182,500,000	194,800,000	194,800,000
C. Safeguards and security				
Construction:				
88-D-104 Safeguards and security upgrade, phase II, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	1,000,000	1,515,000	1,515,000	1,515,000
87-D-104 Safeguards and security enhancement II, LLNL, Livermore, CA	1,150,000	4,650,000	5,300,000	5,300,000
Subtotal, Safeguards and security	2,150,000	6,165,000	6,815,000	6,815,000
Subtotal, Research and development	1,254,915,000	1,262,623,000	1,275,573,000	1,457,573,000
II. Testing				
A. Weapons program				
Operating expenses	437,268,000	447,500,000	447,500,000	465,200,000
Capital equipment	33,550,000	34,450,000	34,450,000	34,450,000
Construction:				
GP-D-101 General plant projects, various locations	7,100,000	7,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000
Subtotal, Weapons program	477,918,000	489,350,000	489,350,000	507,050,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
B. Safeguards and security				
Construction:				
85-D-105 Combined device assembly facility, Nevada Test Site, NV	4,242,000	12,027,000	12,027,000	12,027,000
Subtotal, Testing	482,160,000	501,377,000	501,377,000	519,077,000
Subtotal, Research, development and testing	1,737,075,000	1,764,000,000	1,776,950,000	1,976,650,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,479,486,000)	(1,495,100,000)	(1,495,100,000)	(1,662,800,000)
(Capital equipment)	(141,950,000)	(139,600,000)	(151,900,000)	(171,900,000)
(Construction)	(115,639,000)	(129,300,000)	(129,950,000)	(141,950,000)
III. Production and surveillance				
Operating expenses	2,444,180,000	2,273,600,000	2,218,950,000	2,348,950,000
Capital equipment	128,571,000	87,900,000	87,900,000	87,900,000
Construction:				
Decision costs:				
91-D-122 Short range attack missile tactical (SRAMT) production facilities, various locs.	15,000,000	23,372,000	---	---
90-D-122 Production capabilities for the nuclear depth/strike bomb (ND/SB), various locations	---	10,000,000	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
87-D-122 Short-range attack missile II (SRAM II) warhead production facilities, various locations	8,634,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Decision costs	23,634,000	33,372,000	---	---
Production base:				
Facilities capability assurance program:				
88-D-122 Facilities capability assurance program (FCAP), various locations	106,806,000	47,473,000	47,473,000	47,473,000
Production support facilities:				
GP-D-121 General plant projects, various locations	36,350,000	34,700,000	34,700,000	34,700,000
91-D-123 Production assurance transformer replacement, Kansas City Plant, MO	2,600,000	---	---	---
90-D-124 High explosives (HE) synthesis facility, pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	---	12,927,000	12,927,000	12,927,000
88-D-125 High explosive machining facility Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	8,840,000	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
86-D-130 Tritium loading facility replacement, Savannah River Plant, Aiken, SC.....	2,360,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Production support facilities	50,150,000	47,627,000	47,627,000	47,627,000
Subtotal, Production base - construction	156,956,000	95,100,000	95,100,000	95,100,000
Environment, safety and health:				
92-D-122 Health, Physics/Environmental Projects, RFP, Golden, CO.....................	---	7,200,000	7,200,000	7,200,000
92-D-123 Plant Fire/Security Systems Replacement, RFP, Golden, CO.................	---	5,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000
92-D-126 Replace Emergency Notification Systems, VL................................	---	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
91-D-126 Health physics calibration facility, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, OH........	1,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
91-D-127 Criticality alarm and production annunciation utility replacement, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO...........................	6,600,000	---	---	---
90-D-126 Environment, safety and health enhancements, various locations..............	8,500,000	1,428,000	1,428,000	1,428,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
89-D-126 Environment, safety and health upgrade, Phase II, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, OH	488,000	---	---	---
88-D-124 Fire protection upgrading, various locations	1,481,000	---	---	---
88-D-126 Personnel radiological monitoring laboratories, various locations	1,600,000	---	---	---
85-D-121 Air and water pollution control facilities, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	---	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health	19,669,000	25,028,000	25,028,000	25,028,000
Safeguards and security:				
92-D-125 MSSA/MSTF Sec, Upg, RFP, Golden, CO.	---	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
91-D-124 Safeguards and security upgrades, phase III, Mound Facility, Miamisburg, OH	1,100,000	---	---	---
88-D-123 Security enhancements, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	18,244,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
Subtotal, Safeguards and security	19,344,000	33,500,000	33,500,000	33,500,000
Subtotal, Construction	219,603,000	187,000,000	153,628,000	153,628,000
Subtotal, Production and surveillance	2,792,354,000	2,548,500,000	2,460,478,000	2,590,478,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
IV. Program direction				
Operating expenses	104,715,000	161,750,000	161,750,000	161,750,000
Capital equipment	1,710,000	2,250,000	2,250,000	2,250,000
Subtotal, Program direction	106,425,000	164,000,000	164,000,000	164,000,000
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	4,635,854,000	4,476,500,000	4,401,428,000	4,731,128,000
(Operating expenses)	(4,028,381,000)	(3,930,450,000)	(3,875,800,000)	(4,173,500,000)
(Capital equipment)	(272,231,000)	(229,750,000)	(242,050,000)	(262,050,000)
(Construction)	(335,242,000)	(316,300,000)	(283,578,000)	(295,578,000)
MATERIALS PRODUCTION				
I. Reactor operations				
Operating expenses	811,457,000	584,418,000	584,418,000	584,418,000
Construction:				
Environment, safety and health:				
92-D-141 Reactor Seismic Improvements, Savannah River, SC	---	14,200,000	14,200,000	14,200,000
90-D-150 Reactor safety assurance, Phase I, II, and III, Savannah River, SC	32,600,000	14,530,000	14,530,000	14,530,000
89-D-148 Improved reactor confinement system, Savannah River, SC	12,800,000	12,121,000	12,121,000	12,121,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
85-D-145 Fuel prod. fac., Savannah River, SC...	8,481,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction............................	53,881,000	40,851,000	40,851,000	40,851,000
Subtotal, Reactor operations.........................	865,338,000	625,269,000	625,269,000	625,269,000
II. Processing of nuclear materials				
Operating expenses	628,969,000	531,217,000	531,217,000	546,217,000
Construction:				
Environment, safety and health:				
92-D-142 Nuclear Material Processing Training Center Savannah River SC.............	---	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
92-D-140 F&H canyon exhaust upgrades, Savannah River, SC..........................	---	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
90-D-141 Idaho chemical processing plant fire protection, INEL, ID.....................	6,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
90-D-143 Plutonium finishing plant fire safety and loss limitation, Richland, WA	2,500,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health........	8,500,000	26,500,000	26,500,000	26,500,000
Subtotal, Processing of nuclear materials............	637,469,000	557,717,000	557,717,000	572,717,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
III. Supporting services				
Operating expenses	292,043,000	305,433,000	305,433,000	305,433,000
Construction:				
Programmatic projects:				
92-D-150 Operations Support Facilities, SR	---	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
92-D-151 Plant maintenance and improvements, Phase I, Savannah River, SC	---	4,060,000	4,060,000	4,060,000
92-D-153 Engineering Support Facility, SR	---	8,017,000	8,017,000	8,017,000
91-D-143 Increase 751-A electrical substation capacity, Phase I, Savannah River, SC	6,000,000	2,614,000	2,614,000	2,614,000
GP-D-146 General plant projects, various locations	36,994,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000
90-D-151 Engineering ctr, Savannah River, SC.	4,000,000	105,000	105,000	105,000
86-D-149 Productivity retention program, phases I thru VI, various locations	61,750,000	36,865,000	36,865,000	36,865,000
85-D-139 Fuel processing restoration, idaho fuels processing facility, INEL, ID	87,500,000	82,700,000	82,700,000	82,700,000
Subtotal, Programmatic projects	196,244,000	177,361,000	177,361,000	177,361,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Environment, safety and health:				
92-D-143 Health Protection Instrument Calibration Facility, Savannah River, SC.....	---	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
91-D-145 New whole body counter facility, Savannah River, SC..........................	4,350,000	---	---	---
90-D-149 Plantwide fire protection, phases I and II, Savannah River, SC..................	49,100,000	39,000,000	39,000,000	39,000,000
87-D-159 Environmental, health, and safety improvements, Phases I, II, III, IV and V, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, OH	14,133,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health.......	67,583,000	41,000,000	41,000,000	41,000,000
Safeguards and security:				
89-D-140 Additional separations safeguards, Savannah River, SC	16,300,000	28,150,000	28,150,000	28,150,000
88-D-153 Additional reactor safeguards, Savannah River, SC..........................	1,000,000	6,528,000	6,528,000	6,528,000
Subtotal, Safeguards and security.............	17,300,000	34,678,000	34,678,000	34,678,000
Subtotal, Construction..........................	281,127,000	253,039,000	253,039,000	253,039,000
Subtotal, Supporting services........................	573,170,000	558,472,000	558,472,000	558,472,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
IV. Enriched material	117,801,000	---	---	---
V. Capital equipment	105,622,000	92,198,000	92,198,000	92,198,000
VI. Program direction	42,500,000	43,244,000	43,244,000	43,244,000
TOTAL, MATERIALS PRODUCTION	2,341,900,000	1,876,900,000	1,876,900,000	1,891,900,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,892,770,000)	(1,464,312,000)	(1,464,312,000)	(1,479,312,000)
(Capital equipment)	(105,622,000)	(92,198,000)	(92,198,000)	(92,198,000)
(Construction)	(343,508,000)	(320,390,000)	(320,390,000)	(320,390,000)
WASTE TRANSPORTATION AND SITE MANAGEMENT				
I. Transportation management				
Operating expenses	14,660,000	---	---	---
Capital equipment	531,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Transportation management	15,191,000	---	---	---
II. Program direction/landlord				
Operating expenses	21,386,000	---	---	---
Capital equipment	18,567,000	---	---	---
Construction:				
GP-D-171 General plant projects	13,556,000	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
91-D-175 300 area electrical distribution conversion and safety improvements, phase I Richland, WA	900,000	---	---	---
90-D-175 Landlord program safety compliance-I, Richland, WA	8,230,000	---	---	---
89-D-171 INEL road renovation, ID	7,300,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	29,986,000	---	---	---
TOTAL, WASTE TRANSPORTATION AND SITE MANAGEMENT	85,130,000	---	---	---
(Operating expenses)	(36,046,000)	---	---	---
(Capital equipment)	(19,098,000)	---	---	---
(Construction)	(29,986,000)	---	---	---
OTHER NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS				
I. Verification and control technology				
Operating expenses	181,484,000	214,900,000	209,900,000	209,900,000
Capital equipment	9,924,000	10,100,000	10,100,000	10,100,000
Construction:				
90-D-186 Center for national security and arms control, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	5,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Subtotal, Verification and control technology	196,408,000	235,000,000	230,000,000	230,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(Operating expenses)	(181,484,000)	(214,900,000)	(209,900,000)	(209,900,000)
(Capital equipment)	(9,924,000)	(10,100,000)	(10,100,000)	(10,100,000)
(Construction)	(5,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)
II. Nuclear safeguards and security				
Operating expenses	83,934,000	88,731,000	88,731,000	88,731,000
Capital equipment	5,066,000	5,269,000	5,269,000	5,269,000
Construction:				
GP-D-186 General plant projects	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Subtotal, Nuclear safeguards and security	91,000,000	96,000,000	96,000,000	96,000,000
(Operating expenses)	(83,934,000)	(88,731,000)	(88,731,000)	(88,731,000)
(Capital equipment)	(5,066,000)	(5,269,000)	(5,269,000)	(5,269,000)
(Construction)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)
III. Security investigations - OE	65,000,000	62,600,000	62,600,000	62,600,000
IV. Security evaluations				
Operating expenses	---	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
TOTAL, OTHER NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS	352,408,000	408,600,000	403,600,000	403,600,000
(Operating expenses)	(330,418,000)	(381,231,000)	(376,231,000)	(376,231,000)
(Capital equipment)	(14,990,000)	(15,369,000)	(15,369,000)	(15,369,000)
(Construction)	(7,000,000)	(12,000,000)	(12,000,000)	(12,000,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
NEW PRODUCTION REACTORS				
I. New production reactors				
Operating expenses	134,900,000	152,335,000	152,335,000	135,335,000
Capital equipment	8,800,000	11,200,000	11,200,000	11,200,000
Construction:				
92-D-300 New Production Reactor cap., Var. Loc.	---	334,465,000	371,137,000	334,465,000
92-D-301 NPR safety center, LANL, N. M	---	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
88-D-154 New production reactor capacity, various locations (design only)	231,300,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	231,300,000	336,465,000	373,137,000	336,465,000
TOTAL, NEW PRODUCTION REACTORS	375,000,000	500,000,000	536,672,000	483,000,000
(Operating expenses)	(134,900,000)	(152,335,000)	(152,335,000)	(135,335,000)
(Capital equipment)	(8,800,000)	(11,200,000)	(11,200,000)	(11,200,000)
(Construction)	(231,300,000)	(336,465,000)	(373,137,000)	(336,465,000)
NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT				
I. Naval reactors				
A. Plant development				
Operating expenses	89,300,000	93,000,000	93,000,000	110,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
B. Reactor development				
Operating expenses	258,900,000	268,997,000	268,997,000	268,997,000
C. Reactor operation and evaluation				
Operating expenses	207,000,000	205,600,000	205,600,000	205,600,000
D. Capital equipment	55,400,000	58,400,000	58,400,000	58,400,000
E. Construction				
GP-N-101 General plant projects, various locations	8,600,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
92-D-200 Labortories facilities upgrades, various locations	---	4,900,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, naval reactors facility, ID	4,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
90-N-103 Advanced test reactor off-gas treatment system, INEL, ID	1,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
90-N-104 Facilities renovations, Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory, Niskayuna, NY	7,900,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
89-N-102 Heat transfer test facility, KAPL, Niskayuna, NY	3,600,000	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
88-N-102 Expended core facility receiving station, naval reactors facility, ID	1,500,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	27,400,000	36,200,000	36,200,000	36,200,000
F. Program direction	14,000,000	15,963,000	15,963,000	15,963,000
Subtotal, Naval reactors development	652,000,000	678,160,000	678,160,000	695,160,000
II. Enriched materials				
Operating expenses	---	122,840,000	122,840,000	122,840,000
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT	652,000,000	801,000,000	801,000,000	818,000,000
(Operating expenses)	(569,200,000)	(706,400,000)	(706,400,000)	(723,400,000)
(Capital equipment)	(55,400,000)	(58,400,000)	(58,400,000)	(58,400,000)
(Construction)	(27,400,000)	(36,200,000)	(36,200,000)	(36,200,000)
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT (DEFENSE)				
I. Corrective activities				
A. Environmental management				
Operating expenses	43,846,000	27,689,000	27,689,000	27,689,000
Capital equipment	1,980,000	1,249,000	1,249,000	1,249,000
Construction:				
GP-D-177 General plant projects	3,720,000	3,650,000	3,650,000	3,650,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
89-D-172 Hanford environmental compliance.....	6,800,000	---	---	---
87-D-159 Environmental, health, and safety improvements, phases I, II, III, & IV, feed materials production center, Fernald, OH......	22,601,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction..........................	33,121,000	3,650,000	3,650,000	3,650,000
Subtotal, Environmental management.................	78,947,000	32,588,000	32,588,000	32,588,000
B. Defense programs				
Operating expenses..............................	17,808,000	33,518,000	33,518,000	33,518,000
Capital equipment...............................	---	6,520,000	6,520,000	6,520,000
Construction:				
92-GPD-171 General plant projects............	5,259,000	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
92-D-402 Sanitary sewer system rehab. LLNL....	---	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
92-D-403 Tank upgrades project LLNL...........	---	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
90-D-103 Environment, safety and health improvements, various locations..............	4,200,000	---	---	---
90-D-125 Steam plant ash disposal facility, Y-12 plant, OR..............................	6,000,000	8,122,000	8,122,000	8,122,000
89-D-126 Environmental, safety, & health upgrade, phase II, mound plant, Miamisburg, OH	1,723,000	41,000	41,000	41,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
89-D-142 Reactor effluent cooling water thermal mitigation, Savannah River, SC........	45,600,000	---	---	---
88-D-102 Sanitary wastewaters systems consolidated, LANL, Los Alamos, NM...............	3,500,000	1,546,000	1,546,000	1,546,000
Subtotal, Construction..........................	66,282,000	19,909,000	19,909,000	19,909,000
Subtotal, Defense programs.........................	84,090,000	59,947,000	59,947,000	59,947,000
Subtotal, Corrective activities......................	163,037,000	92,535,000	92,535,000	92,535,000
(Operating expenses)................................	(61,654,000)	(61,207,000)	(61,207,000)	(61,207,000)
(Capital equipment)................................	(1,980,000)	(7,769,000)	(7,769,000)	(7,769,000)
(Construction)................................	(99,403,000)	(23,559,000)	(23,559,000)	(23,559,000)
II. Environmental restoration				
Operating expenses:				
1. Facilities and sites........................	864,141,000	1,074,392,000	1,074,392,000	1,074,392,000
III. Waste management				
Operating expenses:				
1. Waste operations............................	1,266,550,000	1,722,096,000	1,723,796,000	1,723,796,000
Capital equipment................................	82,019,000	95,913,000	95,913,000	95,913,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Construction:				
GP-D-171 General plant projects................	41,154,000	80,677,000	80,677,000	80,677,000
92-D-171 Mixed waste receiving and storage facility, LANL................................	---	6,640,000	6,640,000	6,640,000
92-D-172 Hazardous waste treatment and processing facility, Pantex Plant..............	---	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
92-D-173 NOx abatement facility, ID............	---	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
92-D-174 INEL sanitary landfill, ID............	---	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
92-D-176 B Plant safety class ventilation upgrades, RL................................	---	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
92-D-177 Tank 101-AZ waste retrieval system, RL	---	5,800,000	5,800,000	5,800,000
92-D-180 Inter-Area line upgrade, SR...........	---	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
92-D-181 INEL Fire and life safety improvements, ID..............................	---	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
92-D-182 INEL sewer system upgrade, ID.........	---	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
92-D-183 INEL transportation complex, ID.......	---	895,000	895,000	895,000
92-D-184 Hanford infrastructure underground storage tanks, RL............................	---	300,000	300,000	300,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
92-D-185 Road, ground, and lighting safety improvements, 300/1100 areas, RL...............	---	800,000	800,000	800,000
92-D-186 Steam system rehab., Phase II, RL.....	---	400,000	400,000	400,000
92-D-187 300 area electrical distribution conversion & safety improvements, Phase II, RL.	---	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
91-D-175 300 area electrical distribution conversion and safety improvement,Phase I, RL..	---	4,419,000	4,419,000	4,419,000
91-D-173 Hazardous low-level waste processing tanks, Savannah River Site, SC......	5,800,000	10,100,000	10,100,000	10,100,000
91-D-172 High-level waste tank farm upgrade, Idaho chemical processing plant, INEL, ID......	43,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
91-D-171 Waste receiving and processing facility, module 1, Richland, WA...............	2,700,000	7,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000
90-D-126 ES&H improvements, var. loc...........	---	7,419,000	7,419,000	7,419,000
90-D-171 Laboratory ventilation and electrical system upgrade, Richland, WA..................	4,100,000	1,116,000	1,116,000	1,116,000
90-D-172 Aging waste transfer line, Richland, WA..................................	4,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
90-D-173 B-plant canyon crane replacement, Richland, WA..................................	4,300,000	5,800,000	5,800,000	5,800,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
90-D-174 Decontamination laundry facility, Richland, WA	9,900,000	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
90-D-175 Landlord program safety compliance-I, Richland, WA	2,640,000	8,840,000	8,840,000	8,840,000
90-D-176 Transuranic (TRU) waste facility, Savannah River, SC	15,300,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
90-D-177 RWMC transuranic (TRU) waste treatment and storage facility, ID	26,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
90-D-178 TSA retrieval containment building, ID	30,600,000	4,490,000	4,490,000	4,490,000
89-D-172 Hanford environmental compliance, Richland, WA	63,360,000	27,700,000	27,700,000	27,700,000
89-D-173 Tank farm ventilation upgrade, Richland, WA	3,400,000	4,231,000	4,231,000	4,231,000
89-D-174 Replacement high level waste evaporator, Savannah River, SC	25,330,000	14,145,000	14,145,000	14,145,000
89-D-175 Hazardous waste/mixed waste disposal facility, Savannah River, SC	7,600,000	4,330,000	4,330,000	4,330,000
89-D-122 Production waste storage facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	5,500,000	9,238,000	9,238,000	9,238,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
89-D-141 M-Area waste disposal, Savannah River, SC	7,500,000	4,170,000	4,170,000	4,170,000
88-D-173 Hanford waste vitrification plant (HWVP), Richland, WA	75,500,000	37,000,000	79,200,000	79,200,000
87-D-181 Diversion box and pump pit containment buildings, Savannah River, SC	---	4,697,000	4,697,000	4,697,000
87-D-159 Environmental, health, and safety improvements, phases I, II, III, & IV, feed materials production center, Fernald, OH	4,985,000	---	---	---
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste technology LLNL, Livermore, CA	---	5,060,000	5,060,000	5,060,000
83-D-148 Non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, SC	15,000,000	9,100,000	9,100,000	9,100,000
77-13-F Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, NM	16,900,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	414,569,000	367,067,000	409,267,000	409,267,000
Subtotal, Waste management	1,763,138,000	2,185,076,000	2,228,976,000	2,228,976,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,266,550,000)	(1,722,096,000)	(1,723,796,000)	(1,723,796,000)
(Capital equipment)	(82,019,000)	(95,913,000)	(95,913,000)	(95,913,000)
(Construction)	(414,569,000)	(367,067,000)	(409,267,000)	(409,267,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
IV. Technology development				
Operating expenses	213,480,000	274,778,000	274,778,000	274,778,000
Capital equipment	16,820,000	17,500,000	17,500,000	17,500,000
Construction:				
91-EM-100 Environmental & molecular sciences laboratory, Richland, Washington	---	17,100,000	17,100,000	17,100,000
Subtotal, Technology development	230,300,000	309,378,000	309,378,000	309,378,000
V. Transportation Management				
Operating expenses	---	18,220,000	18,220,000	18,220,000
Plant and capital equipment	---	650,000	650,000	650,000
Subtotal, Transportation Management	---	18,870,000	18,870,000	18,870,000
VI. Program direction	24,106,000	24,749,000	24,749,000	24,749,000
General reduction	---	---	---	-108,528,000
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTOR AND WASTE MGMT (DEFENSE)	3,044,722,000	3,705,000,000	3,748,900,000	3,640,372,000
(Operating expenses)	(2,429,931,000)	(3,175,442,000)	(3,177,142,000)	(3,068,614,000)
(Capital equipment)	(100,819,000)	(121,832,000)	(121,832,000)	(121,832,000)
(Construction)	(513,972,000)	(407,726,000)	(449,926,000)	(449,926,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Education programs	50,000,000	---	---	---
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	11,537,014,000	11,768,000,000	11,768,500,000	11,968,000,000
(Operating expenses)	(9,471,646,000)	(9,810,170,000)	(9,752,220,000)	(9,956,392,000)
(Capital equipment)	(576,960,000)	(528,749,000)	(541,049,000)	(561,049,000)
(Construction)	(1,488,408,000)	(1,429,081,000)	(1,475,231,000)	(1,450,559,000)

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1991	$365,095,000
Budget estimate, 1992	418,073,000
House allowance	414,976,000
Committee recommendation	415,976,000

MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES

Appropriations, 1991	−$150,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	−284,352,000
House allowance	−284,352,000
Committee recommendation	−284,352,000

The Committee recommends a net appropriation of $131,624,000 for departmental administration.

The appropriation recommended for departmental administration supports the Department's general management, administrative, and program support functions not directly associated with program execution. The account provides for: (1) development and analysis of alternative energy policy proposals, legislation, and evaluation of DOE programs; (2) the salaries, travel, and other costs associated with the management and support of DOE; (3) the Institutional Relations Program that provides information services and outreach activities focusing on the industrial, academic, and public communities, evaluation of energy-related inventions and support for energy training and education; (4) development of international energy policy and international cooperation in energy matters; and (5) revenues from the sale of DOE products and services and their related direct costs.

The Committee recommends approval of the budget request for the Reduced Enrichment in Research and Test Reactors [RERTR] Program. These funds will provide continuing support for this important nuclear nonproliferation work under the Office of International Affairs and Energy Emergencies for which the budget request has also been approved.

The Committee recognizes that funds received by the Department from its reimbursable activities may be used to fund general purpose capital equipment which is used in support of those activities.

The following tables show the Committee recommendations by program for new (budget) obligational authority in comparison to the current year, the budget estimate, and the House allowance.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 1991	$28,421,000
Budget estimate, 1992	31,431,000
House allowance	31,431,000
Committee recommendation	31,431,000

An appropriation of $31,431,000 is recommended for the Office of Inspector General of the Department of Energy. This is the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

This appropriation provides agency wide audit and investigative functions to identify and correct management and administrative deficiencies which create conditions for existing or potential instances of fraud, waste, and mismanagement. The audits function provides internal audit, contract audit, and inspections services.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

Section 302(a) of Public Law 95–91 transferred to the Department of Energy the power marketing functions under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and all other functions of the Department of the Interior with respect to the Alaska Power Administration, Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the power marketing functions of the Bureau of Reclamation including the transmission and disposition of electric power and energy from Falcon and Amistad Dams, now included in the Western Area Power Administration.

Bonneville Power operations are self-financing under authority of the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974. The act authorizes Bonneville Power to use its revenues to finance operating costs, capital construction, and to sell bonds to the Treasury, if necessary, to finance any remaining capital program requirements. All of the other power marketing administrations are funded annually with appropriations, and related receipts are deposited in the Treasury.

RATE AND REPAYMENT REFORM

The administration is proposing rate and repayment reforms in fiscal year 1992 that would cause significant increases in the rates charged by the power marketing administrations. The Committee believes that this type of reform would have significant adverse impacts on the economic health of the regions supported by the PMA's and might result in less repayment to the Federal Government because of the loss of significant energy-intensive industries in the regions.

Therefore, the Committee has again included bill language preventing a change from a cost base to market base for PMA rates. This language is intended to prevent a unilateral change in the terms of agreement that were made years ago between the Federal Government and the regions served by the PMA's.

PMA STAFFING LEVELS

Last year the Committee took action to prevent interference with the PMA Administrators' establishment of appropriate employment levels for their organizations (section 510 of Public Law 101-514). The Committee took this action because PMA employment levels are supported by electric power ratepayers, not the Federal taxpayers. The Committee believes the staffing levels included in the President's budget are not adequate for the Administrators to carry our their responsibilities. The Committee expects the executive branch to comply with section 510 of Public Law 101-514. In addition, the PMA should not have to compete against other U.S. Government entities, such as the other units of the Department of Energy, for the personnel resources required to carry out their missions. Therefore, the Committee intends that PMA employment levels shall not be counted in and shall be separate from the Department of Energy's other employment levels. This will also assure that the Secretary of Energy's ability to carry out the responsibilities of the Department shall not be adversely impacted by the Administrators' exercise of flexibility to set their own employment levels.

The following table summarizes the appropriations recommended for the power marketing administrations.

ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1991	$3,233,000
Budget estimate, 1992	3,218,000
House allowance	3,218,000
Committee recommendation	3,218,000

An appropriation of $3,218,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

The Alaska Power Administration is responsible for operation, maintenance, and power marketing of two Federal hydroelectric projects in Alaska. The operating projects are the 30,000- kilowatt Eklutna project near Anchorage and the 47,160-kilowatt Snettisham project near Juneau. Project facilities include dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission systems, and necessary maintenance facilities. Power is marketed at wholesale to five Alaskan utilities. The projects represent a current Federal investment of $174,000,000 and a replacement value in excess of $336,000,000.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

The Bonneville Power Administration [BPA] is the Federal electric power marketing agency in the Pacific Northwest, a 300,000-square-mile service area that encompasses Oregon, Washington, Idaho, western Montana, and small portions of adjacent Western States in the Columbia River drainage basin. BPA markets electric power from 30 Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation projects, as well as thermal energy from non-Federal generating facilities in the region. BPA also markets and exchanges surplus electric power interregionally over the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie with California, and in Canada over interconnections with utilities in British Columbia.

BPA constructs, operates, and maintains the Nation's largest high-voltage transmission system (14,779 circuit-miles of transmission line and 388 substations by the end of fiscal year 1990).

Public Law 93–454, the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974, placed BPA on a self-financed basis. With the passage in 1980 of Public Law 96–501, the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act, BPA's responsibilities were expanded to include meeting the net firm load growth of the region, to protect fish and wildlife resources, and to invest in cost-effective, regionwide energy conservation and to acquire generating resources to meet these requirements.

Borrowing authority.—A total of $3,750,000,000 has been made available to BPA as permanent borrowing authority. Each year the Committee reviews the budgeted amounts BPA plans to use of this total and reports a recommendation on Bonneville's borrowing requirements. For fiscal year 1992, the Committee recommends an additional increment of $340,300,000 in new borrowing authority for fiscal year 1992 for transmission system construction, system replacement, energy resources, fish and wildlife, and capital equipment programs. This recommendation is consistent with the budget request which included $385,700,000 of planned capital investment

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION				
Administrative operations:				
Office of the Secretary—salaries and expenses	$4,110,000	$2,886,000	$2,886,000	$2,886,000
General management—personnel compenstion and benefits	169,074,000	159,360,000	159,360,000	159,360,000
General management—other expenses:				
Travel	5,775,000	5,477,000	5,477,000	5,477,000
Service	139,977,000	145,818,000	145,818,000	145,818,000
Capital equipment	5,434,000	6,862,000	6,862,000	6,862,000
Subtotal, other expenses	151,186,000	158,157,000	158,157,000	158,157,000
Program support:				
Policy analysis and system studies	4,351,000	6,448,000	4,351,000	4,351,000
Consumer affairs	45,000	47,000	47,000	47,000
Public affairs	284,000	55,000	55,000	55,000
International policy studies	2,496,000	2,459,000	1,459,000	2,459,000
Office of minority economic impact	3,612,000	3,640,000	3,640,000	3,640,000
Subtotal, program support	10,788,000	12,649,000	9,552,000	10,552,000
Subtotal, administrative operations	335,158,000	333,052,000	329,955,000	330,955,000
Cost of work for others	76,643,000	99,021,000	99,021,000	99,021,000
Miscellaneous revenues	−150,000,000	−284,352,000	−284,352,000	−284,352,000
Subtotal, Departmental Administration	261,801,000	147,721,000	144,624,000	145,624,000
Use of unobligated balances	−46,706,000	−14,000,000	−14,000,000	−14,000,000
Total, Departmental Administration	215,095,000	133,721,000	130,624,000	131,624,000
(Operating expenses)	(209,661,000)	(126,859,000)	(123,762,000)	(124,762,000)
(Capital equipment)	(5,434,000)	(6,862,000)	(6,862,000)	(6,862,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION				
Operation and maintenance:				
Power marketing:				
Operating expenses	$3,233,000	$3,318,000	$3,318,000	$3,318,000
Use of prior year balances		–100,000	–100,000	–100,000
Total, Alaska Power Administration	3,233,000	3,218,000	3,218,000	3,218,000
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION				
Operation and maintenance:				
Power marketing:				
Operating expenses	2,624,000	2,749,000	2,749,000	2,749,000
Purchase power and wheeling	17,661,000	22,120,000	22,120,000	22,120,000
Use of prior year balances	–11,000,000	–1,000,000	–1,000,000	–1,000,000
Total, Southeastern Power Administration	9,285,000	23,869,000	23,869,000	23,869,000
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION				
Operation and maintenance:				
Power marketing:				
Operating expenses	17,316,000	18,217,000	18,217,000	18,217,000
Purchase power and wheeling	7,899,000	7,071,000	7,071,000	7,071,000
Construction	10,182,000	8,432,000	8,432,000	8,432,000
Use of prior year balances	–15,290,000	–5,256,000	–5,256,000	–5,256,000
Total, Southwestern Power Administration	20,107,000	28,464,000	28,464,000	28,464,000

WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

Operation and maintenance:				
Power marketing:				
Construction and rehabilitation	110,520,000	109,985,000	109,985,000	109,985,000
System operation and maintenance	115,509,000	118,636,000	118,636,000	118,636,000
Purchase power and wheeling	95,298,000	105,857,000	105,857,000	105,857,000
Unobligated balances	−27,565,000	−3,000,000	−28,000,000	−8,000,000
Transfer of permanent authority from DOI	(4,702,000)	(5,465,000)	(5,465,000)	(5,465,000)
Total, Western Area Power Administration	293,762,000	331,478,000	306,478,000	326,478,000

obligations to be financed by $340,300,000 of new borrowing authority and $45,400,000 for cash reserves generated by revenues. The request and recommendation includes a $49,600,000 estimate of obligation of borrowing authority for the Third A.C. Intertie.

Repayment.—The Committee notes with approval the continuing improvements in BPA's financial condition. In fiscal year 1990, BPA paid the U.S. Treasury $619,000,000, including $162,796,000 for amortization. At the end of fiscal year 1990, BPA was current in its payments of interest and amortization to the Treasury.

Pacific intertie.—The Committee supports completion of the full 4,800 megawatt project assuming suitable agreements for the operation of such a project can be completed.

TRANSMISSION SYSTEM RELIABILITY

By letter of May 23, 1991, the General Services Administration notified the Department of Energy that the blanket exception for the power marketing administrations on mandatory use of the Local Telecommunications Service Program and FTS 2000 has been canceled. GSA seeks additional information as to the need for such an exception and, absent receiving satisfaction, has stated all PMA services should be transitioned to the FTS 2000 network by September 30, 1991. This is the second time in recent years GSA has visited this issue, having provided the exception in 1988 after reviewing and concurring that the PMA's have unique telecommunications mission requirement; for the control, monitoring, operation, and maintenance of their electric power transmission systems to ensure safe, reliable, and efficient operation.

The PMA's use microwave relay systems, rather than telephone service, in order to operate and remotely control their power systems at required reliability levels. Critical real-time control signals, unique to the electric utility industry, are required to provide necessary control and protection of high voltage equipment and preserve power system stability. For reliability reasons, none of the PMA's nor any utility in the United States, considers such commercial telephone services acceptable for operating their bulk power systems. In the case of the Bonneville Power Administration, its microwave telecommunications systems are interconnected with compatible communications systems in over 100 other electric utilities in a coordinated power grid that covers the entire western United States and Canada.

The Committee is very concerned about the potential intrusion of GSA and the Governmentwide telephone system into the area of power system control, and the costly and reliability degrading impact this would represent. The Committee directs that neither the PMA's nor the DOE take any action which would reduce the reliability of or forestall the PMA planned replacement, expansion or improvement of PMA telecommunications systems.

Renewable resource developments.—The Committee supports the collaborative efforts of the Bonneville Power Administration, the Northwest Power Planning Council [NPPC], and the Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference Committee to confirm and expand the supply of conservation and renewable resources in consultation with industry. This resource supply expansion program addresses the objective of moving conservation and renewable resource technologies into the marketplace. The Committee understands BPA intends to spend $2,000,000 in fiscal year 1992 and encourages BPA, working with other entities, to move forward expeditiously to achieve the goals of the NPPC's confirmation agendas. The Committee directs BPA to prepare a report on the progress of the resource supply expansion program by March 1, 1992.

Operational flexibility.—This Committee has played a strong and continuing role in the development and operation of the Bonneville Power Administration including its business-like operations and financial and budget activities. In past Energy and Water Development appropriations acts and committee reports, the Committee has felt it necessary to provide further clarification to assure that the Bonneville Administrator retains sufficient planning, operational, and financial flexibilities to continue successful business operations of the ratepayer-financed Federal Columbia River power system [FCRPS]. The Committee strongly believes that the only portion of the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990, Public Law 101–576 (31 U.S.C. et. seq.), that applies to BPA is limited to that portion which amends 31 U.S.C. sections 9105 (audits) and 9106 (financial audits of Government corporations). These sections apply to BPA because they amend the Government Corporation Control Act (Public Law 97–258, 31 U.S.C. section 9101 et seq.) which applies to BPA, 16 U.S.C. section 8381(c). Congress considered the financial practices of entities such as BPA, that are subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, and determined that such practices were not to be changed except to the extent of amendments to sections 9105 and 9106. BPA continues to be a separate and distinct entity within the Department of Energy. The Administrator continues to be responsible for operation of the FCRPS, including the hiring and firing of personnel and the setting of performance standards as well as setting BPA's financial practices. Nothing in the CFO Act or its legislative history indicates any intent to repeal or amend any of BPA's authorities or responsibilities. The Committee believes the Secretary of Energy should recognize and act consistent with the above in any implementation of Public Law 101–576 as well as in ongoing operations of the agency. The Committee continues to hold the Bonneville Administrator responsible and accountable for the successful ongoing operation of the FCRPS and recognizes the requirement for the Administrator to continue to have authorities and flexibilities commensurate with that responsibility.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1991	$9,285,000
Budget estimate, 1992	23,869,000
House allowance	23,869,000
Committee recommendation	23,869,000

The Committee recommendation concurs with House action which appropriates $23,869,000 for the Southeastern Power Administration.

The Southeastern Power Administration [SEPA] markets hydroelectric power produced at Federal projects located in 10 Southeastern States in accordance with policy directives contained in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944. The States include Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, and Mississippi. There are 22 projects now in operation with an installed capacity of 3,092,375 kilowatts.

Southeastern does not own or operate any transmission facilities and carries out its marketing program by utilizing the existing transmission systems of the power utilities in the area. This is accomplished through wheeling arrangements between Southeastern and each of the area utilities with transmission lines connected to the projects. The utility agrees to deliver specified amounts of Federal power to customers for the Government, and Southeastern agrees to compensate the utility of the wheeling service performed.

The Committee recommends $23,869,000 for fiscal year 1992 which will provide for the continuation of the basic power marketing program. SEPA's budget request for purchase power and wheeling has been steadily increasing for several years. The increase in appropriations required for fiscal year 1992 is due to a significant decrease in the availability of unobligated balances from prior years and increased charges for transmission services.

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1991	$20,107,000
Budget estimate, 1992	28,464,000
House allowance	28,464,000
Committee recommendation	28,464,000

The Committee recommends concurrence with the House allowance of $28,464,000. This is the same as the budget request.

The Southwestern Power Administration [SWPA] is the marketing agent for the disposal of power and energy generated at U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' hydroelectric plants in the six-State area of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Louisiana. It is headquartered in Tulsa, OK, with an operation control center located in Springfield, MO, and maintenance crews and support warehouses located in Muskeg and Ada, OK; Jonesboro, AR; and Springfield, MO.

The SWPA provides transmission lines, substations, switching stations, and communication facilities for integration and optimal distribution of electricity from hydroelectric projects for transmission and sale of power to geographically dispersed customers.

The SWPA schedules and controls the generation of power from 23 hydroelectric projects. In addition, the SWPA operates and maintains 1,380 miles of transmission lines consisting of 161 kilovolts, 138 volts, and 69 kilovolts wood pole and steel construction. It performs maintenance on 35 radio and microwave stations, 34 switching stations and substations, with a total installed capacity of 2,158,000 kilowatts.

WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1991	$293,762,000
Budget estimate, 1992	331,478,000
House allowance	306,478,000
Committee recommendation	326,478,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $326,478,000 which is the same as the House allowance.

The Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance Program of the Western Area Power Administration [WAPA], excluding the Colorado River storage project and Fort Peck project, involves marketing federally generated hydroelectric power within a 15-State area in the West.

Western is responsible for the operation and maintenance of more than 16,000 miles of transmission lines and 265 substations. Electric power marketed by Western is generated by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the International Boundary and Water Commission in Texas, all of which operate some 51 hydropower generating plants in Western's service area with a current maximum operating capacity of 10,389 megawatts.

The Committee concurs with the House Committee on the construction of the Harold T. "Bizz" Johnson California-Oregon Transmission Project.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1991	$122,750,000
Budget estimate, 1992	141,071,000
House allowance	141,071,000
Committee recommendation	141,071,000

REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriations, 1991	$122,750,000
Budget estimate, 1992	141,071,000
House allowance	141,071,000
Committee recommendation	141,071,000

The Committee concurs with the House action in recommending $141,071,000 for salaries and expenses of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission [FERC].

Section 204 and title IV of Public Law 95–91, the Department of Energy Organization Act, established within the Department of Energy, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission [FERC] to carry out functions transferred from the Federal Power Commission for hydroelectric, electric utility, and natural gas regulation and from the Interstate Commerce Commission for oil pipeline regulation.

The act sets out the clear intent of Congress that the Commission be independent from supervision or direction from any other officer of the Department, but provides that the Secretary shall provide to the Commission such support and facilities as the Commission determines it needs to carry out its functions. This support includes services for personnel, accounting, facilities support, computer operations, procurement, and other similar services funded elsewhere in the departmental request.

On April 19, 1991, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit issued its decision in the case of *Process Gas Consumers* v. *FERC*, case No. 89-1739, which remanded Gas Research Institute's [GRI] R&D programs in natural gas vehicles and emissions control back to the FERC for further consideration. In order for both programs to pass the strict cost/benefit test laid down by the court, the FERC had relied on environmental benefits which would result from natural gas vehicles and cofiring of gas with coal. The court rejected the FERC's reliance on these environmental benefits.

The decision in this case greatly concerns this Committee. The approach taken by the court was contrary to the Nation's desire for clean air through alternative transportation fuels and cleaner production of electricity from coal. This amendment will give the FERC the authority it needs to approve GRI's R&D on natural gas vehicles and emission control using natural gas, by allowing FERC to consider the environmental benefits to existing and future ratepayers.

GRI has over $7,500,000 in natural gas vehicle research at risk if these programs are not approved. This program is more important than just this amount of money because it represents the cofunding for an important R&D program with GM just recently announced, totaling $40,000,000. Additionally, programs with Ford and Chrysler are in the final stages of negotiation and will also rely on this funding. If the natural gas vehicle programs were to be terminated, vital activities with the three major domestic car manufacturers would be suspended.

If the emissions control programs were terminated pursuant to the court's opinion, then DOE's clean coal technology programs would be severely impacted. GRI is participating in round I (in Illinois) and round III (in Colorado). In addition, GRI is funding cofiring research in Oklahoma, Indiana, Ohio, and Minnesota which could be impacted.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1991	$170,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	100,000,000
House allowance	170,000,000
Committee recommendation	190,000,000

The Committee recommends $190,000,000 for the Appalachian Regional Commission [ARC] activities, including salaries and expenses. An additional $90,000,000 over the budget request has been included for the Appalachian highway program.

Within the amount recommended for Appalachian regional development programs, the Committee has provided $47,000,000 for Corridor H and $21,000,000 for Corridor G.

The Committee has included $400,000 to continue the tourism development work being conducted in accordance with Senate Report 101-378 accompanying the fiscal year 1991 appropriations bill.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1991	$11,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	12,000,000
House allowance	11,500,000
Committee recommendation	11,500,000

The Committee recommendation concurs with the House in providing $11,500,000 for salaries and expenses of the Defense Nuclear Safety Board.

The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board was created by the 1989 Defense Authorization Act. The Board, appointed by the President, advises the Secretary of Energy and reports to Congress on safety matters of the Department's defense nuclear reactors.

The Committee recommendation of $11,500,000 reflects a reduction of $500,000 because of the availability of prior years unobligated funds. The recommended funding level combined with the unobligated balances provide full funding for activities proposed in 1992.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $263,000
Budget estimate, 1992	300,000
House allowance	300,000
Committee recommendation	300,000

[1] Includes $39,000 appropriated in the Fiscal Year 1991 Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act.

An appropriation of $300,000 is recommended for the Delaware River Basin Commission salaries and expenses. This is the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

The Delaware River Basin Commission was created by compact (under Public Law 87-328) among the States of Delaware, New Jersey, New York, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the Federal Government. The compact enables the Commission to participate jointly in the development of water and related resources of the region drained by the Delaware River and its tributaries.

CONTRIBUTION TO DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1991	$457,000
Budget estimate, 1992	475,000
House allowance	475,000
Committee recommendation	475,000

The Committee concurs with the House in recommending $475,000 for fiscal year 1992.

This appropriation provides the Federal share of the annual expenses of the Commission. The compact provides that the amount required to balance the Commission's current expense budget shall be apportioned equitably among the signatory parties by unanimous vote of the Commission. The Commission's expense budget for 1992 is $2,829,000.

INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

CONTRIBUTION TO INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Appropriations, 1991	$538,000
Budget estimate, 1992	....
House allowance	510,000
Committee recommendation	510,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $510,000 for the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.

The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin was created in 1940 by compact among the States in the basin of Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the District of Columbia, and the Federal Government. The Commission has the responsibility for basinwide water quality, planning, program coordination, and assistance.

The Committee has provided $210,000 for the Commission to support the Anacostia River study.

The Committee expects the Commission to continue to work with the communities of Petersburg and Moorefield, WV, on flood control measures.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

GROSS APPROPRIATIONS

Appropriations, 1991	$461,320,000
Budget estimate, 1992	508,810,000
House allowance	508,810,000
Committee recommendation	508,810,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 1991	−$153,450,000
Budget estimate, 1992	−488,848,000
House allowance	−488,848,000
Committee recommendation	−488,848,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1991	$307,870,000
Budget estimate, 1992	19,962,000
House allowance	19,962,000
Committee recommendation	19,962,000

A net appropriation of $19,962,000 is recommended for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission [NRC].

The Committee notes that the administration proposed that the entire net appropriation for the NRC be derived from the nuclear waste fund. These funds are required to fund the NRC efforts focused on implementation of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act as amended in 1987 and DOE's efforts to characterize the Yucca Mountain site.

The Committee believes that timely completion of design certification reviews for new standardized reactor designs, is vital to making the nuclear option available to electric utilities in their mid-1990's planning process so as to meet the country's baseload generation needs by the end of the decade. In this regard, the Committee remains concerned about schedule slippages for completion of design certification reviews by the Commission for evolutionary and passive reactors and is disturbed by the Commission's failure to fully respond to the Congress' previous directive to comply with the earlier announced schedule. Since the Commission, in its recent action, has defined the required level of design detail for these new designs that is necessary to ensure public health and safety, the Committee directs the Commission to dedicate the necessary resources to the design review process to maintain the schedule for completing certification review for evolutionary and passive reactors by 1991–92 and 1994–95 respectively. The Committee further directs the Commission to submit a report annually with the budget request, describing progress in the certification of standardized advanced light water reactor designs, plans for current and subsequent fiscal years and the resources necessary to maintain the established schedules.

The Committee also urges that priority be given to expediting the review of plant license renewal. The Committee is also concerned that the NRC not take any regulatory action which would have a negative impact on the nuclear training programs developed by the nuclear industry.

Finally, the Committee notes increases in the Commission's requests year after year in staffing and funding in every mission area. At some point, increased spending on research in areas with direct connections to operational reactor safety, and increased numbers of regulations in ever-expanding areas of reactor operations, will bring diminishing returns and lead to overregulation that may, in fact, impact the level of safety achieved to date. Therefore, the Committee questions the need for across-the-board increases in all mission areas and directs the Commission to initiate an external review of the effectiveness and cost efficiency of proposed additional programs.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1991	$3,680,000
Budget estimate, 1992	3,690,000
House allowance	3,690,000
Committee recommendation	3,690,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 1991	
Budget estimate, 1992	−$3,690,000
House allowance	−3,690,000
Committee recommendation	−3,690,000

The appropriation recommended provides for the Office of the Inspector General of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

The Inspector General Acts Amendments of 1988 established a statutory Office of the Inspector General within the NRC, effective on April 17, 1989. The functions of the Office of the Inspector General is to provide the Commission with an independent review and appraisal of the integrity of NRC programs and operations. Internal audits review and evaluate all facets of agency operations. The investigative function provides for the detection and investigation of improper and illegal activities involving agency programs, personnel, and operations.

Recent legislation requires the Office of Inspector General of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to offset expenses with NRC user fees. The fiscal year 1992 budget request and the Committee recommendation reflect this legislation.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $250,000
Budget estimate, 1992	284,000
House allowance	284,000
Committee recommendation	284,000

[1] Includes $39,000 appropriated in the Fiscal Year 1991 Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act.

The Committee recommends $284,000 for salaries and expenses of the U.S. Commissioner and his staff, and is the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

The Susquehanna River Basin Commission was created by compact (Public Law 91-575) among the States of Maryland, New York, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the Federal Government to enable them to participate jointly in the development of water and related resources of the region drained by the Susquehanna River basin and its tributaries.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1991	$290,000
Budget estimate, 1992	310,000
House allowance	310,000
Committee recommendation	310,000

An amount of $310,000 is recommended by the Committee, which is the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

This appropriation provides for the Federal share of the annual expenses of the Commission. The compact provides that the amount required to balance the Commission's current expenses budget shall be apportioned equitably among the signatory parties by unanimous vote of the Commission.

The 1992 current expense budget of the Commission is $310,000.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

Appropriations, 1991	$135,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	91,266,000
House allowance	135,000,000
Committee recommendation	135,000,000

The Committee recommend an appropriation of $135,000,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority [TVA].

TVA has been entrusted with a broad array of public lands, associated facilities, and natural resources in connection with research, development, operation, and management activities conducted by the agency to fulfill its mission. To assure present day use and the availability of these resources and facilities for future generations, adequate stewardship is required to preserve and enhance this Federal investment. This responsibility includes maintaining a system of dams, reservoirs, and navigation facilities; refurbishing outmoded public facilities and other structures; performing adequate routine and cyclic maintenance; and maintaining and managing over 300,000 acres of public land and 11,000 miles of shoreline in an efficient and environmentally sound manner.

In addition, the Committee believes that the TVA should evaluate if and how the agency can respond to the National Competitiveness Technology Transfer Act of 1989. The unique capabilities of TVA as a national demonstration laboratory may offer special opportunities for joint ventures with the private sector through the use of TVA's technical and scientific expertise.

The following table shows the allocation of the funds recommended for activities under this heading.

RECOMMENDED APPROPRIATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1991 estimate	1992 budget request	1993 Committee recommendation
Stewardship	65,800	60,419	65,000
Water and land	13,100	4,935	12,000
Land Between The Lakes	3,400	2,891	3,600
Rural development	19,700		20,100
National Fertilizer and Environmental Research Center	33,000	23,021	34,300
Total appropriations	135,000	91,266	135,000

OTHER TEMPORARY COMMISSIONS

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1991	
Budget estimate, 1992	$3,294,000
House allowance	3,294,000
Committee recommendation	3,294,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $3,294,000, which is the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

This appropriation provides for the Office of the Nuclear Waste Negotiator. The Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments of 1987 directed the Nuclear Waste Negotiator to attempt to find a State or Indian tribe willing to host a nuclear waste repository or monitored retrievable storage facility at a technically qualified site on reasonable terms and to negotiate with any State or Indian tribe which expresses an interest in hosting a repository or monitored retrievable storage facility.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Committee recommendation is to concur with the general provisions, as passed by the House of Representatives, except for section 508 which the Committee has stricken. The Committee amendment striking section 508 was adopted unanimously by voice vote. Section 508 as passed by the House bars the use of funds appropriated for the implementation of Public Law 101-576, the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990.

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

PREPARED IN CONSULTATION WITH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PURSUANT TO SEC. 308(a), PUBLIC LAW 93-344, AS AMENDED

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount of bill	Committee allocation	Amount of bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with Committee allocations to its subcommittees of amounts in the First Concurrent Resolution for 1992: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development:				
Defense	11,980	11,980	11,570	[1] 11,569
International				
Domestic	10,040	10,040	9,280	9,241
Mandatory				
Projection of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
1992		22,019		[1] 13,051
1993				7,568
1994				1,271
1995				87
1996 and future years				43
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 1992 in bill	NA	182	NA	9

[1] Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

[2] Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

NA: Not applicable.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992—PERMANENT AUTHORITY

[These funds become available automatically under earlier, or "permanent" law without further, or annual action by the Congress. Thus, these amounts are not included in the accompanying bill.]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1991	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1992	Fiscal year 1992 estimate compared with, fiscal year 1991
FEDERAL FUNDS			
Corps of Engineers—Civil: Permanent appropriations	$13,000,000	$13,000,000	
Department of the Interior:			
Bureau of Reclamation, misc. appropriations	280,000	280,000	
Colorado River dam fund, Boulder Canyon project	61,275,000	60,128,000	−$1,147,000
Department of Energy:			
Payments to States under Federal Power Act	2,424,000	2,424,000	
Bonneville Power Administration Fund (authority to borrow)	326,900,000	340,300,000	+13,400,000
Tennessee Valley Authority Fund (authority to borrow)	619,253,000	1,134,884,000	+515,631,000
Total, Federal funds	1,023,132,000	1,551,016,000	+527,884,000
TRUST FUNDS			
Corps of Engineers—Civil:			
Rivers and harbors contributed funds	176,000,000	228,840,000	+52,840,000
Coastal wetlands restoration trust fund		34,012,000	+34,012,000
Department of the Interior: Reclamation trust funds	85,195,000	79,000,000	−6,195,000
Department of Energy: Advances for cooperative work	15,690,000	14,768,000	−922,000
Appalachian Regional Commission: Miscellaneous trust funds	4,564,000	4,564,000	
Total, Trust funds	281,449,000	361,184,000	+79,735,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992

[Amounts in dollars]

Item (1)	1991 appropriation (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Committee recommendation (5)	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or –)		
					1991 appropriation (6)	Budget estimate (7)	House allowance (8)
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL							
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY							
Corps of Engineers - Civil							
General investigations	146,435,000	160,342,000	200,566,000	176,211,000	+29,776,000	+15,869,000	-24,355,000
Construction, general	1,143,086,000	1,222,357,000	1,264,991,000	1,327,441,000	+184,355,000	+105,084,000	+62,450,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	344,606,000	346,550,000	353,437,000	353,437,000	+8,831,000	+6,887,000	---
Operation and maintenance, general	1,450,669,000	1,514,935,000	1,547,855,000	1,537,265,000	+86,596,000	+22,330,000	-10,590,000
Regulatory program	71,100,000	86,000,000	86,000,000	86,000,000	+14,900,000	---	---
Flood control and coastal emergencies	20,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	-5,000,000	---	---
General expenses	126,600,000	150,000,000	142,000,000	142,000,000	+15,400,000	-8,000,000	---
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil, new budget (obligational) authority	3,302,496,000	3,495,184,000	3,609,849,000	3,637,354,000	+334,858,000	+142,170,000	+27,505,000
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR							
Bureau of Reclamation							
General investigations	13,221,000	12,614,000	13,789,000	13,204,000	-17,000	+590,000	-585,000
Construction program	667,897,000	546,279,000	553,209,000	564,409,000	-103,488,000	+18,130,000	+11,200,000
Operation and maintenance	221,516,000	258,685,000	258,685,000	258,685,000	+37,169,000	---	---
Loan program	5,708,000	890,000	890,000	2,890,000	-2,818,000	+2,000,000	+2,000,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(4,946,000)	---	---	---	(-4,946,000)	---	---
General administrative expenses	51,431,000	57,266,000	53,745,000	53,745,000	+2,314,000	-3,521,000	---
Emergency fund	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	---	---	---
Working Capital fund	4,831,000	5,900,000	5,900,000	5,900,000	+1,069,000	---	---
Colorado River Dam fund (by transfer, permanent authority)	(-4,702,000)	(-5,465,000)	(-5,465,000)	(-5,465,000)	(-763,000)	---	---
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	965,604,000	882,634,000	887,218,000	899,833,000	-65,771,000	+17,199,000	+12,615,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior:							
New budget (obligational) authority	965,604,000	882,634,000	887,218,000	899,833,000	-65,771,000	+17,199,000	+12,615,000
(By transfer)	(-4,702,000)	(-5,465,000)	(-5,465,000)	(-5,465,000)	(-763,000)	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(4,946,000)	---	---	---	(-4,946,000)	---	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item (1)	1991 appropriation (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Committee recommendation (5)	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					1991 appropriation (6)	Budget estimate (7)	House allowance (8)
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY							
Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities:							
Operating Expenses	2,215,952,000	2,508,115,000	2,542,158,000	2,626,021,000	+410,069,000	+117,906,000	+83,863,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	311,130,000	313,313,000	311,895,000	314,895,000	+3,765,000	+1,582,000	+3,000,000
Total	2,527,082,000	2,821,428,000	2,854,053,000	2,940,916,000	+413,834,000	+119,488,000	+86,863,000
Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities:							
Operating Expenses	1,262,473,000	1,454,276,000	1,244,876,000	1,274,876,000	+12,403,000	-179,400,000	+30,000,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	77,545,000	92,724,000	92,724,000	92,724,000	+15,179,000	---	---
Subtotal	1,340,018,000	1,547,000,000	1,337,600,000	1,367,600,000	+27,582,000	-179,400,000	+30,000,000
Gross revenues	-1,450,400,000	-1,547,000,000	-1,547,000,000	-1,547,000,000	-96,600,000	---	---
Net appropriation	-110,382,000	---	-209,400,000	-179,400,000	-69,018,000	-179,400,000	+30,000,000
General Science and Research Activities:							
Operating Expenses	796,224,000	835,074,000	835,074,000	835,074,000	+38,850,000	---	---
Plant and Capital Equipment	352,508,000	713,865,000	570,415,000	672,415,000	+319,907,000	-41,450,000	+102,000,000
Total	1,148,732,000	1,548,939,000	1,405,489,000	1,507,489,000	+358,757,000	-41,450,000	+102,000,000
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	242,833,000	305,071,000	305,071	295,071,000	+52,238,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000
Isotope production and distribution fund	---	8,500,000	8,500	8,500,000	+8,500,000	---	---
Environmental restoration and waste management:							
Defense function	(3,044,722,000)	(3,705,000,000)	(3,748,900,00	(3,640,372,000)	(+595,650,000)	(-64,628,000)	(-108,528,000)
Non-defense function	(437,023,000)	(523,495,000)	(602,495,0	(602,495,000)	(+165,472,000)	(+79,000,000)	---
Total, Environmental restoration and waste mgmt.	(3,481,745,000)	(4,228,495,000)	(4,351,395,	(4,242,867,000)	(+761,122,000)	(+14,372,000)	(-108,528,000)
Atomic Energy Defense Activities:							
Operating Expenses	9,471,646,000	9,810,170,000	9,752,220,000	9,956,392,000	+484,746,000	+146,222,000	+204,172,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	2,065,368,000	1,957,830,000	2,016,280,000	2,011,608,000	-53,760,000	+53,778,000	-4,672,000
Total	11,537,014,000	11,768,000,000	11,768,500,000	11,968,000,000	+430,986,000	+200,000,000	+199,500,000

Departmental Administration:							
Operating Expenses	359,661,000	411,211,000	408,114,000	409,114,000	+49,453,000	-2,097,000	+1,000,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	5,434,000	6,862,000	6,862,000	6,862,000	+1,428,000	---	---
Subtotal	365,095,000	418,073,000	414,976,000	415,976,000	+50,881,000	-2,097,000	+1,000,000
Miscellaneous revenues	-150,000,000	-284,352,000	-284,352,000	-284,352,000	-134,352,000	---	---
Net appropriation	215,095,000	133,721,000	130,624,000	131,624,000	-83,471,000	-2,097,000	+1,000,000
Office of the Inspector General	28,421,000	31,431,000	31,431,000	31,431,000	+3,010,000	---	---
Power Marketing Administrations							
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Power Administration	3,233,000	3,218,000	3,218,000	3,218,000	-15,000	---	---
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	9,285,000	23,869,000	23,869,000	23,869,000	+14,584,000	---	---
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	20,107,000	28,464,000	28,464,000	28,464,000	+8,357,000	---	---
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	293,762,000	331,478,000	306,478,000	326,478,000	+32,716,000	-5,000,000	+20,000,000
(By transfer, permanent authority)	(4,702,000)	(5,465,000)	(5,465,000)	(5,465,000)	(+763,000)	---	---
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	326,387,000	387,029,000	362,029,000	382,029,000	+55,642,000	-5,000,000	+20,000,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission							
Salaries and expenses	122,750,000	141,071,000	141,071,000	141,071,000	+18,321,000	---	---
Revenues Applied	-122,750,000	-141,071,000	-141,071,000	-141,071,000	-18,321,000	---	---
Geothermal Resources Development Fund							
Geothermal loan guarantee and interest assistance program	80,000	---	---	---	-80,000	---	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(500,000,000)	---	---	---	(-500,000,000)	---	---
Total, title III, Department of Energy: New budget (obligational) authority	15,915,262,000	17,004,119,000	16,656,297,000	17,085,660,000	+1,170,398,000	+81,541,000	+429,363,000
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES							
Appalachian Regional Commission	170,000,000	100,000,000	170,000,000	190,000,000	+20,000,000	+90,000,000	+20,000,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	11,000,000	12,000,000	11,500,000	11,500,000	+500,000	-500,000	---
Delaware River Basin Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	263,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	+37,000	---	---
Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission	457,000	475,000	475,000	475,000	+18,000	---	---
Total, Delaware River Basin Commission	720,000	775,000	775,000	775,000	+55,000	---	---
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin:							
Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	538,000	---	510,000	510,000	-28,000	+510,000	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1991 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					1991 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	461,320,000	508,810,000	508,810,000	508,810,000	+47,490,000	---	---
Revenues	-153,450,000	-488,848,000	-488,848,000	-488,848,000	-335,398,000	---	---
Subtotal	307,870,000	19,962,000	19,962,000	19,962,000	-287,908,000	---	---
Office of Inspector General	3,680,000	3,690,000	3,690,000	3,690,000	+10,000	---	---
Revenues	---	-3,690,000	-3,690,000	-3,690,000	-3,690,000	---	---
Subtotal	3,680,000	---	---	---	-3,680,000	---	---
Total, Nuclear Regulatory Commission	311,550,000	19,962,000	19,962,000	19,962,000	291,588,000	---	---
Susquehanna River Basin Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	250,000	284,000	284,000	284,000	+34,000	---	---
Contribution to Susquehanna River Basin Commission	290,000	310,000	310,000	310,000	+20,000	---	---
Total, Susquehanna River Basin Commission	540,000	594,000	594,000	594,000	+54,000	---	---
Tennessee Valley Authority: Tennessee Valley Authority Fund	135,000,000	91,266,000	135,000,000	135,000,000	---	+43,734,000	---
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	---	3,294,000	3,294,000	3,294,000	+3,294,000	---	---
Total, title IV, Independent agencies, new budget (obligational) authority	629,348,000	227,891,000	341,635,000	361,635,000	-267,713,000	+133,744,000	+20,000,000
Grand total:							
New budget (obligational) authority	20,812,710,000	21,609,828,000	21,494,999,000	21,984,482,000	+1,171,772,000	+374,654,000	+489,483,000
(By transfer)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(4,946,000)	---	---	---	(-4,946,000)	---	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(500,000,000)	---	---	---	(-500,000,000)	---	---